



Air and Radiation

<http://www.epa.gov/air/noise.html>
Last updated on Monday, July 16, 2012

You are here: [EPA Home](#) [Air and Radiation](#) Noise Pollution

Noise Pollution

Announcements

On this page:

- [What is Noise Pollution?](#)
- [Health Effects](#)
- [Protection from Noise](#)
- [The Role of EPA](#)
- [Noise Sources Regulated by EPA](#)
- [Current Activities](#)
- [Frequently Asked Questions](#)
- [Resource Center](#)

August 5, 2009 - Revised Regulation for the Labeling of Hearing Protection Devices (HPD) Proposed
[See Current Activities](#)

You will need Adobe Acrobat Reader to view the Adobe PDF files on this page.
See [EPA's PDF page](#) for more information about getting and using the free Acrobat Reader.

What is Noise Pollution?

The traditional definition of noise is "unwanted or disturbing sound". Sound becomes unwanted when it either interferes with normal activities such as sleeping, conversation, or disrupts or diminishes one's quality of life. The fact that you can't see, taste or smell it may help explain why it has not received as much attention as other types of pollution, such as air pollution, or water pollution. The air around us is constantly filled with sounds, yet most of us would probably not say we are surrounded by noise. Though for some, the persistent and escalating sources of sound can often be considered an annoyance. This "annoyance" can have major consequences, primarily to one's overall health.

Health Effects

Noise pollution adversely affects the lives of millions of people. Studies have shown that there are direct links between noise and health. Problems related to noise include stress related illnesses, high blood pressure, speech interference, hearing loss, sleep disruption, and lost productivity. Noise Induced Hearing Loss (NIHL) is the most common and often discussed health effect, but research has shown that exposure to constant or high levels of noise can cause countless adverse health affects.

Learn more about the health effects:

<http://www.nonoise.org/library/handbook/handbook.htm> [EXIT Disclaimer](#)

<http://www.nonoise.org/library/suter/suter.htm> [EXIT Disclaimer](#)

Protection from Noise

Individuals can take many steps to protect themselves from the harmful effects of noise pollution. If people must be around loud sounds, they can protect their ears with hearing protection (e.g., ear plugs or ear muffs). There are various strategies for combating noise in your home, school, workplace, and the community.

Learn more about noise pollution prevention:

<http://www.nonoise.org> [EXIT Disclaimer](#)

The Role of EPA

Under the Clean Air Act, the EPA administrator established the Office of Noise Abatement and Control (ONAC) to carry out investigations and studies on noise and its effect on the public health and welfare. Through ONAC, the EPA coordinated all Federal noise control activities, but in 1981 the Administration concluded that noise issues were best handled at the State and local level. As a result, ONAC was closed and primary responsibility of addressing noise issues was transferred to State and local governments. However, EPA retains authority to investigate and study noise and its effect, disseminate information to the public regarding noise pollution and its adverse health effects, respond to inquiries on matters related to noise, and evaluate the effectiveness of existing regulations for protecting the public health and welfare, pursuant to the Noise Control Act of 1972 and the Quiet Communities Act of 1978.

Learn more about the Clean Air Act, Noise Control Act of 1972, and the Quiet Communities Act of 1978:

[Clean Air Act \(Title IV – Noise Pollution\)](#)

[The Noise Control Act of 1972 \(42USC7641\)\(PDF\)](#) (21pp, 890k)

[The Quiet Communities Act of 1978](#)

Noise Sources Regulated by EPA

EPA or a designated Federal agency regulates noise sources, such as rail and motor carriers, low noise emission products, construction equipment, transport equipment, trucks, motorcycles, and the labeling of hearing protection devices. For additional information, see <http://publicaccess.supportportal.com/ics/support/default.asp?deptID=23012&task=knowledge&questionID=15642> or contact the following:

Catrice Jefferson
Mailing Address:
U.S. EPA Headquarters
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Ariel Rios Building - Mail Code 6103A
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: jefferson.catrice@epa.gov

Current Activities

EPA is currently revising its regulation for the Labeling of Hearing Protection Devices (HPD) (i.e., ear plugs, ear muffs, communication headsets, etc.), [40CFR, Part 211 Subpart B](#) that are sold wholly or in part on the basis of their effectiveness to reduce unwanted sound (noise) as well as those products that emit noise that may adversely affect the public health and welfare.

EPA has been working with the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) to revise the regulation on the basis of addressing the following:

- New technology devices that have evolved since the 1979 promulgation of the labeling regulation.
- Regulatory testing of effectiveness that is based on an outdated ANSI standard.
- Required testing and effectiveness rating methods that are not suitable for many new technology devices.
- Many new technology devices are precluded from sale as "hearing protectors" by required test method and rating scheme.

Learn more about these activities:

- [Press Release Announcing the Establishment of a New Noise Labeling Program \(1979\)](#)
- [EPA Workshop on Hearing Protection Devices \(2003\) \(PDF\)](#) (212pp, 5.1 MB)
[EXIT Disclaimer](#)
- [EPA Docket \(#OAR-2003-0024\)](#)
- [EPA Noise Library](#) [EXIT Disclaimer](#)
- [Fact Sheet - Proposed Revisions to the Product Noise Labeling Regulation for Hearing Protection Devices \(PDF\)](#) (3pp, 22k) - August 5, 2009
- [Federal Register Notice - Proposed Revisions to the Product Noise Labeling Regulation for Hearing Protection Devices](#) - August 5, 2009

Frequently Asked Questions

EPA is usually the first line of contact when there are questions regarding noise pollution. However, the roles have shifted and State and local governments have acquired the responsibility of responding to many noise pollution matters.

For State Environmental Agencies, see <http://www.epa.gov/epahome/state.htm>

Some of the commonly asked questions from the public relate to noises in the community (from your neighbor, boom cars, lawn equipment, etc.) and from commercial businesses (factory, auto mechanic shop, etc.), aviation, railroad/locomotive horn noise, and interstate motor carrier.

For answers, see

<http://publicaccess.supportportal.com/ics/support/default.asp?deptID=23012&task=knowledge&questionID=15642>

Resource Center

To learn more about noise and the adverse health effects of noise exposure, tools for children and teachers, conferences and workshops, and much more, please visit the following organizations.

- [Noise Pollution Clearinghouse](#) [EXIT Disclaimer](#)
- [Noise Off](#) [EXIT Disclaimer](#)
- [American Speech-Language-Hearing Association](#) [EXIT Disclaimer](#)
- [League for the Hard of Hearing](#) [EXIT Disclaimer](#)
- [National Hearing Conservation Association](#) [EXIT Disclaimer](#)
- [Council for Accreditation in Occupation Hearing Conservation](#) [EXIT Disclaimer](#)
- [American Academy of Audiology](#) [EXIT Disclaimer](#)
- [NIOSH Compendium](#) [EXIT Disclaimer](#)

For Kids and Teachers

- [Listen UP! Play It Safe With Your Ears. Play It Safe With Your Health. For Elementary School Students\(PDF\)](#) (15pp, 6.5 MB)- For a hard copy, please contact jefferson.catrice@epa.gov
- [Say What? Play It Safe With Your Ears. Play It Safe With Your Health. For Middle School Students\(PDF\)](#) (16pp, 2.4 MB)- For a hard copy, please contact jefferson.catrice@epa.gov
- [Noise and Its Effects on Children. Information for parents, teachers, and childcare providers\(PDF\)](#) (2pp, 2 MB) - For a hard copy, please contact jefferson.catrice@epa.gov
- [Noise Coloring Book \(PDF\)](#) (10pp, 2.2 MB) [EXIT Disclaimer](#)
- [Dangerous Decibels](#) [EXIT Disclaimer](#)
- [American Speech-Language Hearing Association Ear Bud Campaign](#) [EXIT Disclaimer](#)
- [National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders](#) [EXIT Disclaimer](#)
- [National Hearing Conservation Association](#) [EXIT Disclaimer](#)

Does the EPA regulate noise? Where are there resources about noise pollution?

Community noise

EPA does not have any regulatory authority governing noise in local communities. You should consult with your local governmental (e.g., city and county) authorities to see if there are local or state laws that might apply to your situation. In addition, many states run noise pollution programs. To contact your state environmental agency for more information on their programs and regulations, see <http://www.epa.gov/epahome/state.htm>

The Noise Pollution Clearinghouse, <http://www.nonoise.org> EXIT Disclaimer, provides many noise-related resources, including:

- EPA documents that are not on EPA's site: <http://www.nonoise.org/epa.htm> EXIT Disclaimer
- A list of citizen organizations that combat noise: <http://www.nonoise.org/quietnet.htm> EXIT Disclaimer
- Resources for noises from air bags, barking dogs, boom cars, construction, jet skis, leaf blowers, personal computers, racetracks, swimming pool filter motors, and vehicles <http://www.nonoise.org/resource.htm> EXIT Disclaimer
- A law library: <http://www.nonoise.org/lawlib.htm> EXIT Disclaimer

Other sources of noise

In the past, EPA coordinated all federal noise control activities through its Office of Noise Abatement and Control. In 1981, the Administration at that time concluded that noise issues were best handled at the state or local government level. As a result, the EPA phased out the office's funding in 1982 as part of a shift in federal noise control policy to transfer the primary responsibility of regulating noise to state and local governments. The Noise Control Act of 1972 and the Quiet Communities Act of 1978, however, were not rescinded by Congress and remain in effect today, although essentially unfunded.

Note that all federal noise regulations remain in effect, and are enforced by either EPA or a designated federal agency. These regulations cover standards for transportation equipment, motor carriers, low-noise-emission products, and construction equipment. You can view them at the Government Printing Office Web site at

http://ecfr.gpoaccess.gov/cgi/t/text/text-idx?sid=8b62aa545305455a88fd40506ad10718&c=ecfr&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title40/40cfrv24_02.tpl
(scroll to Subchapter G)

The contact listed below can assist you with issues related to the federal noise regulations.

Catrice Jefferson
Mailing address:
U.S. EPA Headquarters
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Ariel Rios Building - Mail Code 6103A
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: jefferson.catrice@epa.gov

- **Airport noise:** EPA still works on issues related to airport noise. Please contact one of the EPA individuals above for assistance.
 - **Aviation noise:** Information about aircraft or plane noise can be obtained from the Federal Aviation Administration Web site, http://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/apl/noise_emissions/
In addition, the Federal Interagency Committee on Aviation Noise (FICAN) was formed in 1993 to provide forums for debate over future research needs to better understand, predict and control the effects of aviation noise, and to encourage new technical development efforts in these areas. FICAN: <http://www.fican.org/> EXIT Disclaimer
 - **Railroad/locomotive horn noise:** The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) Web site includes information on the Railroad Noise Emission Compliance Regulations from the Code of Federal Regulations (49 CFR 210), <http://www.fra.dot.gov/us/content/264>
The FRA Web site also includes information about the 2005 Use of Locomotive Horns Final Rule at <http://www.fra.dot.gov/us/content/1318>
 - **Interstate motor carrier noise:** The Federal Highway Administration's Office of Motor Carrier and Highway Safety Web site includes information on the Interstate Motor Carrier Noise Emission Compliance Regulations from the Code of Federal Regulations (49 CFR 325) at <http://www.fmcsa.dot.gov/rules-regulations/administration/fmcsr/fmcsrguidedetails.aspx?menukey=325>
-

Menu

United States Environmental Protection Agency

Search EPA.gov

Clean Air Act Overview

- Share
- Contact Us

Clean Air Act Title IV - Noise Pollution

The 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments added a new title IV, relating to acid deposition control, *without repealing the existing title IV, relating to noise pollution*. The U.S. Code designates the original title IV (noise pollution) as subchapter IV and the new title IV (acid deposition control) as subchapter IV-A.

This page has links to Clean Air Act sections that are part of the U.S. Code Collection maintained by the U. S. Government Publishing Office. EPA does not control the content of that website. EXIT

Clean Air Act Section	U.S. Code	Title
201	7641	Noise abatement
	7642	Authorization of appropriations

What is Noise Pollution?

The traditional definition of noise is “unwanted or disturbing sound”. Sound becomes unwanted when it either interferes with normal activities such as sleeping, conversation, or disrupts or diminishes one’s quality of life. The fact that you can’t see, taste or smell it may help explain why it has not received as much attention as other types of pollution, such as air pollution, or water pollution. The air around us is constantly filled with sounds, yet most of us would probably not say

we are surrounded by noise. Though for some, the persistent and escalating sources of sound can often be considered an annoyance. This “annoyance” can have major consequences, primarily to one’s overall health.

[Top of Page](#)

Health Effects

Noise pollution adversely affects the lives of millions of people. Studies have shown that there are direct links between noise and health. Problems related to noise include stress related illnesses, high blood pressure, speech interference, hearing loss, sleep disruption, and lost productivity. Noise Induced Hearing Loss (NIHL) is the most common and often discussed health effect, but research has shown that exposure to constant or high levels of noise can cause countless adverse health affects.

Learn more about the health effects:

The Noise Effects Handbook, Office of Noise Abatement and Control, US EPA, 1981 [EXIT](#)
Noise and Its Effects, by Dr. Alice H. Suter, Administrative Conference of the United States, November 1991 [EXIT](#)

[Top of Page](#)

Protection from Noise

Individuals can take many steps to protect themselves from the harmful effects of noise pollution. If people must be around loud sounds, they can protect their ears with hearing protection (e.g., ear plugs or ear muffs). There are various strategies for combating noise in your home, school, workplace, and the community.

Learn more about noise pollution prevention:

Noise Pollution Clearinghouse [EXIT](#)

[Top of Page](#)

The Role of EPA

Under the Clean Air Act, the EPA administrator established the Office of Noise Abatement and Control (ONAC) to carry out investigations and studies on noise and its effect on the public health and welfare. Through ONAC, the EPA coordinated all Federal noise control activities, but in 1981 the Administration concluded that noise issues were best handled at the State and local level. As a result, ONAC was closed and primary responsibility of addressing noise issues was transferred to State and local governments. However, EPA retains authority to investigate and study noise and its effect, disseminate information to the public regarding noise pollution and its adverse health effects, respond to inquiries on matters related to noise, and evaluate the effectiveness of existing regulations for protecting the public health and welfare, pursuant to the Noise Control Act of 1972 and the Quiet Communities Act of 1978.

Learn more about the Clean Air Act, Noise Control Act of 1972, and the Quiet Communities Act of 1978:

Clean Air Act (Title IV – Noise Pollution)

The Noise Control Act of 1972 (42USC7641) (21 pp, 890K, [About PDF](#)), from U.S. General Services Administration (GSA)

The Quiet Communities Act of 1978 [EXIT](#)

[Top of Page](#)

Noise Sources Regulated by EPA

EPA or a designated Federal agency regulates noise sources, such as rail and motor carriers, low noise emission products, construction equipment, transport equipment, trucks, motorcycles, and the labeling of hearing protection devices. For additional information, see EPA's Public Access Environmental Knowledgebase.

[Top of Page](#)

Past Activities

Learn more about these activities:

- [Press Release Announcing the Establishment of a Noise Labeling Program \(1979\)](#)
- [EPA Workshop on Hearing Protection Devices \(PDF\) \(212 pp, 5.1 MB\) - March 27-28, 2003, Noise Pollution Clearinghouse](#) [EXIT](#)
- [EPA Docket \(#OAR-2003-0024\) Labeling of Hearing Protection Devices](#)
- [Noise Pollution Clearinghouse](#) [EXIT](#)
- [Fact Sheet - Proposed Revisions to the Product Noise Labeling Regulation for Hearing Protection Devices](#)
- [Federal Register Notice - Proposed Revisions to the Product Noise Labeling Regulation for Hearing Protection Devices - August 5, 2009](#)

[Top of Page](#)

Frequently Asked Questions

EPA is usually the first line of contact when there are questions regarding noise pollution. However, the roles have shifted and State and local governments have acquired the responsibility of responding to many noise pollution matters.

For State Environmental Agencies, see EPA's [Health and Environmental Agencies of U.S. States and Territories](#) webpage.

Some of the commonly asked questions from the public relate to noises in the community (from your neighbor, boom cars, lawn equipment, etc.) and from commercial businesses (factory, auto mechanic shop, etc.), aviation, railroad/locomotive horn noise, and interstate motor carrier.

For answers, see EPA's Public Access Environmental Knowledgebase.

[Top of Page](#)

Resource Center

To learn more about noise and the adverse health effects of noise exposure, tools for children and teachers, conferences and workshops, and much more, please visit the following organizations.

The following links exit the site EXIT

- Noise Pollution Clearinghouse
- Noise Off
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association
- Center for Hearing and Communication (formerly the League for the Hard of Hearing)
- National Hearing Conservation Association
- Council for Accreditation in Occupational Hearing Conservation
- American Academy of Audiology
- National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health Hearing Protector Device Compendium

For Kids and Teachers

- Noise Pollution Materials for Kids and Teachers - includes coloring books and information brochures suitable for children and educators.
- Related web sites

The following links exit the site EXIT

- Dangerous Decibels
- American Speech-Language Hearing Association Ear Bud Campaign
- National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders
- National Hearing Conservation Association

[Top of Page](#)

[*<Clean Air Act Table of Contents by Title>*](#)

Contact Us to ask a question, provide feedback, or report a problem.

Clean Air Act Overview Home

Progress Cleaning the Air

Air Pollution Challenges

Requirements and History

Role of Science and Technology

Roles of State, Local, Tribal and Federal Governments

Developing Programs Through Dialogue

Flexibility with Accountability

The Clean Air Act and the Economy

Discover.

Accessibility

EPA Administrator

Budget & Performance

Contracting

Grants

No FEAR Act Data

Privacy and Security

Connect.

Data.gov

Inspector General

Ask.

Contact Us

Hotlines

Jobs

Newsroom

Open Government

Regulations.gov

Subscribe

USA.gov

White House

FOIA Requests

Frequent Questions

Follow.

LAST UPDATED ON JANUARY 4, 2017

Administrative Conference of the United States

Noise and Its Effects

Dr. Alice H. Suter

Conference Consultant

(November 1991)

This report was prepared for the consideration of the Administrative Conference of the United States. The views expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the members of the Conference or its committees except where formal recommendations of the Conference are cited.

[Top](#)[Return to NPC Library](#)[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page i

[I. Introduction 1](#)[II. ONAC'S Activities in Noise Effects Research and Criteria 2](#)[III. Physical Properties and Measurement of Sound 3](#)[A. Physical Properties 3](#)[B. Instrumentation 3](#)[C. Measurement and Descriptors 3](#)[IV. Noise in America 5](#)[A. Population Trends 5](#)[B. Noise Sources 5](#)[1. Road traffic noise 5](#)[2. Aircraft noise 7](#)[3. Noise from railroads 7](#)[4. Construction noise 7](#)[5. Noise in industry 7](#)[6. Noise in buildings 8](#)[7. Noise from consumer products 8](#)[C. Numbers of People Exposed to Noise 9](#)[D. Summary: Noise in America 11](#)[V. Effects of Noise 14](#)[A. Noise-Induced Hearing Loss 14](#)[1. Extent of noise-induced hearing loss from environmental sources 14](#)[2. The handicap of noise-induced hearing loss 15](#)

- 3. The study of noise-induced hearing loss 15
- 4. Risk of hearing impairment from continuous noise 15
- 5. Varying and intermittent noise 16
- 6. Impulse noise 16
- 7. Susceptibility 16
- 8. Interactions with other agents 17
- 9. Hearing protectors 17
- 10. Summary: Noise-induced hearing loss 17

B. Interference With Communication 18

- 1. Prediction of speech interference 18
- 2. Criteria for speech and warning signals 19
- 3. The effect of hearing protectors on speech and warning signal perception 19
- 4. Scholastic performance 19
- 5. Summary: Interference with communication 20

C. Effects of Noise on Sleep 20

- 1. Assessing sleep disturbance 20
- 2. Criteria for sleep interference 21
- 3. After-effects and habituation 21
- 4. Summary: Effects of noise on sleep 21

D. Effects on Performance and Behavior 22

- 1. Sensory and motor effects 22
- 2. Noise variables 22
- 3. Task variables 23
- 4. After-effects 23
- 5. Effects of noise on social behavior 23
- 6. Summary: Effects on performance and behavior 24

E. Extra-Auditory Health Effects 24

- 1. Theoretical basis 24
- 2. Effects on blood pressure 25
- 3. Effects on blood chemistry 26
- 4. Interactions 26
- 5. Other adverse effects 26

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page ii

- 6. Summary: Extra-auditory effects 27

F. Annoyance 27

- 1. Predicting annoyance for public policy purposes 27
- 2. Metrics 28
- 3. Criteria 28
- 4. Sources 29
- 5. Nonacoustics variables 32

[6. Habituation 32](#)
[7. Annoyance and health 35](#)
[8. Summary: Annoyance 35](#)

[VI. Conclusions 36](#)
[References 37](#)

[Top](#)
[Return to NPC Library](#)
[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 1

I. Introduction

This report presents an overview of noise and its effects on people. Special emphasis is placed on developments over the past decade, both in terms of noise conditions and noise effects research. By doing so, this report should illustrate some of the reasons for concern about noise problems, which persist after the closing of EPA's Office of Noise Abatement and Control (ONAC).

Noise has a significant impact on the quality of life, and in that sense, it is a health problem in accordance with the World Health Organization's (WHO) definition of health. WHO's definition of health includes total physical and mental well-being, as well as the absence of disease. Along these lines, a 1971 WHO working group stated: "Noise must be recognized as a major threat to human well-being." (Suess, 1973)

The effects of noise are seldom catastrophic, and are often only transitory, but adverse effects can be cumulative with prolonged or repeated exposure. Although it often causes discomfort and sometimes pain, noise does not cause ears to bleed and noise-induced hearing loss usually takes years to develop. Noise-induced hearing loss can indeed impair the quality of life, through a reduction in the ability to hear important sounds and to communicate with family and friends. Some of the other effects of noise, such as sleep disruption, the masking of speech and television, and the inability to enjoy one's property or leisure time also impair the quality of life. In addition, noise can interfere with the teaching and learning process, disrupt the performance of certain tasks, and increase the incidence of antisocial behavior. There is also some evidence that it can adversely affect general health and well-being in the same manner as chronic stress. These effects will be discussed in more detail in the paragraphs below.

[Top](#)
[Return to NPC Library](#)
[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 2

II. ONAC'S Activities in Noise Effects Research and Criteria

In response to the mandates of Section 5 of the Noise Control Act of 1972, ONAC published Public Health and welfare Criteria for Noise (EPA, 1973a) and Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety (EPA, 1974a), popularly known as the "Levels Document" for obvious reasons). Also in 1973, ONAC sponsored an international conference in Yugoslavia on the effects of noise, from which voluminous proceedings there published (EPA, 1973b). All of these documents there widely distributed and, although somewhat dated, are still read and referenced today. Because a considerable amount of research in this area has been conducted over the past 2 decades, these documents would benefit from revision.

In these documents ONAC established dose-response relationships for noise and its effects, and identified safe levels of noise to prevent hearing loss and activity interference. The agency also established the day-night average noise level as a universal descriptor to be used in assessing the impact of community noise.

Section 14 of the Act directs ONAC to conduct or finance research on noise effects, including investigations of the psychological and physiological effects of noise on humans and the effects of noise on animals. Approximately 35 technical reports resulted from these efforts, as well as contractor reports and numerous articles in scientific journals. Some of the more noteworthy examples of EPA's research program there:

- Projects involving the cardiovascular effects of noise at the University of Miami, Johns Hopkins University and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Peterson, et al., 1978, 1981, 1983; Hattis and Richardson, 1980; Turkkan et al, 1983).
- A longitudinal study of noise exposure and hearing threshold levels in children conducted by the Fels Institute (Roche et al., 1977).
- An interagency agreement with the U.S. Air Force to study the effects of noise on hearing (e.g., Guignard, 1973; Johnson, 1973; Schori and McGatha, 1978; Suter, 1978).
- A study identifying the sound levels of speech communication in various environments (Pearsons, et al., 1977).
- Two studies at Northeastern University comparing methods for predicting the loudness and acceptability of noise (Scharf et al., 1977; Scharf and Hellman, 1979).

Although much useful information was derived from these programs, some of them were irreparably damaged by the abrupt termination of funding from ONAC that occurred in 1981 and 1982. For one example, the Johns Hopkins study of cardiovascular effects of noise on primates was terminated after testing on only one subject had been completed. For another, the longitudinal data from the Fels Institute is now of little value after a hiatus of more than a decade.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 3

III. Physical Properties and Measurement of Sound

A. Physical Properties

Noise is often defined as unwanted sound. To gain a satisfactory understanding of the effects of noise, it would be useful to look briefly at the physical properties of sound.

Sound is the result of pressure changes in a medium (usually air), caused by vibration or turbulence. The amplitude of these pressure changes is stated in terms of sound level, and the rapidity with which these changes occur is the sound's frequency. Sound level is measured in decibels (abbreviated dB), and sound frequency is stated in terms of cycles per second, or nowadays, Hertz (abbreviated Hz). Sound level in decibels is a logarithmic rather than a linear measure of the change in pressure with respect to a reference pressure level. A small increase in decibels can represent a large increase in sound energy. Technically, an increase of 3 dB represents a doubling of sound energy, and an increase of 10 dB represents a tenfold increase. The ear, however, perceives a 10-dB increase as doubling of loudness.

Another important aspect is the duration of the sound, and the way it is distributed in time. Continuous sounds have little or no variation in time, varying sounds have differing maximum levels over a period of time, intermittent sounds are interspersed with quiet periods, and impulsive sounds are characterized by relatively high sound levels and very short durations.

The effects of noise are determined mainly by the duration and level of the noise, but they are also influenced by the frequency. Long-lasting, high-level sounds are the most damaging to hearing and generally the most annoying. High-frequency sounds tend to be more hazardous to hearing and more annoying than low-frequency sounds. The way sounds are distributed in time is also important, in that intermittent sounds appear to be somewhat less damaging to hearing than continuous sounds because of the ear's ability to regenerate during the intervening quiet periods. However, intermittent and impulsive sounds tend to be more annoying because of their unpredictability.

B. Instrumentation

The instrument for measuring noise is the basic sound level meter or a number of its derivatives, including noise dose meters (usually called dosimeters), integrating sound level meters, graphic level recorders, and community noise analyzers. Improvements in all of these instruments have taken place during the last decade. This is especially true of the computerized dosimeters and integrating meters, which can measure, compute, store, and display comprehensive data on the noise field (Earshen, 1986). These instruments are now able to measure over very wide dynamic ranges and to measure impulsive sounds with a high degree of accuracy.

C. Measurement and Descriptors

Most sound level meters and dosimeters use built-in frequency filters or "weighting networks" in the measurement process. By far the most frequently used filter is the A weighting network, which discriminates against low-frequency and very high-frequency sounds. A weighting approximates the equal-loudness response of the ear at moderate sound levels, and correlates well with both hearing

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 4

damage and annoyance from noise. A weighting will be assumed throughout this report unless otherwise specified.

Composite measures of noise, such as the **equivalent continuous sound level (Leq)** and the day-night average sound level (DNL) incorporate A weighting. (The mathematical notation for DNL is Ldn.) These levels constitute sound energy averages over given periods of time; the DNL incorporates a 10-dB nighttime penalty from 10:00 pm to 7:00 am, meaning that events occurring during that time are counted as 10 dB higher than they really are. A variant of the DNL that is used in California (and Europe) is the community noise equivalent level (CNEL), which incorporates a 5-dB penalty for evening noise events, as well as the 10-dB nighttime penalty (California Code of Regulations, 1990).

For more than a decade, both the DNL and the simple Leq have been used extensively for assessing the impact of aircraft/airport noise. Recently, however, communities have expressed dissatisfaction with these metrics when used to regulate noise (Wesler, 1990). Metrics that employ averaging fail to describe the disturbance arising from single events, especially low-flying aircraft, unexpected or newly occurring flights, or flights occurring in areas where solitude is at a premium. The sound exposure level (SEL), an event's sound level normalized to one second, is gaining popularity as a supplement to the DNL and the Leq for characterizing single events.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 5

IV. Noise in America

A. Population Trends

The U.S. population has increased an average of 25 million with each census since 1950. According to the World Almanac (1991), the population in 1980 was 226 million and approximately 250 million in 1990. This reflects an increase of nearly 11 percent over the decade, or slightly more than 1 percent per year. Presently, 77 percent of the U.S. population lives in the nation's 283 designated metropolitan areas, and the rate of growth in these areas is twice that of nonmetropolitan areas (Bryant, 1991).

Not surprisingly, EPA research indicates that noise levels in communities is directly related to the population density (EPA, 1974b).⁽¹⁾ Because the noise in urban areas generally exceeds that of suburban and rural areas, it is not unreasonable to assume that noise in the U.S. is increasing at least in proportion to the increase in urbanization and more rapidly than the growth of the general population. In addition, noise sources appear to be multiplying at a faster pace than the population.

B. Noise Sources

Figure 1, from EPA's simplified version of the Levels Document, Protective Noise Levels, shows the range of sound levels for some common noise sources (EPA, 1978). Most leading noise sources will fall into the following categories: road traffic, aircraft, railroads, construction, industry, noise in buildings, and consumer products.

1. Road traffic noise

In its Levels Document (1974), EPA estimated that road traffic noise was the leading source of community noise. EPA's contractors found that to be true in 1981 (EPA, 1981), and there is little reason to believe otherwise today.

Truck transportation, as a convenient and economical means of moving raw materials and consumer goods from place to place, is growing at a faster pace than the general population. For example, a total (2) of 33.6 million trucks were registered in the U.S. in 1980. That number grew to 45.5 million in 1989, an increase of about 35 percent (American Trucking Assoc., 1991).

Noise from the motors and exhaust systems of large trucks provides the major portion of highway noise impact, and provides a potential noise hazard to the driver as well.⁽³⁾ In addition, noise from the interaction of tires with the roadway is generated by trucks, buses, and private autos.

In the city, the main sources of traffic noise are the motors and exhaust systems of autos, smaller trucks, buses, and motorcycles. This type of noise can be augmented by narrow streets and tall buildings, which produce a "canyon" in which traffic noise reverberates.

(1) The day-night average sound level appears to be proportional to the log of population density in people per square mile (EPA, 1974b).

(2) The total number of trucks registered includes personal-use as well as commercial trucks of all weight classes.

(3) According to Reinhart (1991) the most common complaint about truck noise is related to problems caused by tampering with the mufflers of trucks using compression brakes. About 5 percent of the heavy trucks surveyed by Reinhart and his colleagues had no functioning muffler, despite the existence of antitampering laws.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

[Link to Figure 1](#)
[Typical Range of Common Sounds](#)

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 7

2. Aircraft noise

Air traffic also appears to be increasing more rapidly than the U.S. population. In 1980, U.S. scheduled airlines flew approximately 255.2 billion passenger miles and 5.7 billion cargo (ton) miles. By 1990, these figures were 457.9 billion and 10.6 billion, respectively (Air Transport Assoc., 1991a). This represents an increase of 79 percent in passenger mileage, and 86 percent in air freight mileage. Air cargo traffic has grown particularly rapidly in the last five years, and will probably continue that trend over the next decade.

By 1989, the quieter "Stage III" airplanes comprised nearly 40 percent of the domestic fleet (Air Transport Assoc., 1991b). By the year 2004, all of the noisier Stage II aircraft must be phased out (Airport Noise and Capacity Act, 1990). This requirement should promote a quieter environment around airports, but the growth of air transportation and the pressing need for airport expansion threatens to offset the benefits of the quieter aircraft.

Nowadays, the problem of low-flying military aircraft has added a new dimension to community annoyance, as the nation seeks to improve its "nap-of-the-earth" warfare capabilities. In addition, the issue of aircraft operations over national parks, wilderness areas, and other areas previously unaffected by aircraft noise has claimed national attention over recent years (Fidell, 1990; Cantoni, 1991; Weiner, 1990; Mouat, 1990).

3. Noise from railroads

The noise from locomotive engines, horns and whistles, and switching and shunting operations in rail yards can impact neighboring communities and railroad workers. For example, rail car retarders can produce a high-frequency, high-level screech that can reach peak levels of 120 dB at a distance of 100 feet (EPA, 1974), which translates to levels as high as 138 or 140 dB at the railroad worker's ear.

Unlike truck and air transportation, however, rail transportation does not appear to be increasing. According to the Association of American Railroads, the railroad industry loaded 22.1 million freight cars in 1988, down slightly from 22.6 million in 1980 (AAR, 1991).

4. Construction noise

The noise from construction of highways, city streets, and buildings is a major contributor to the urban scene. Construction noise sources include pneumatic hammers, air compressors, bull dozers, loaders, dump trucks (and their back-up signals), and pavement breakers. The construction industry has done very well over recent years with a value-added GNP of \$97.9 billion in 1977, increasing to \$247.7 billion in 1989 (Dept. of Commerce, 1991), an increase of about 153 percent. The number of workers employed in construction grew from 4.3 million in 1980 to about 5.2 million in 1990, an increase of nearly 21 percent (BLS, 1991a).

5. Noise in industry

Although industrial noise is one of the less prevalent community noise problems, neighbors of noisy manufacturing plants can be disturbed by sources such as fans, motors, and compressors mounted on the outside of

buildings. Interior noise can also be transmitted to the community through open windows and doors, and even through building walls. These interior noise sources have significant impacts on industrial workers, among whom noise-induced hearing loss is unfortunately common.

The size of the U.S. manufacturing industry has not grown significantly over the last decade. Although the industrial GNP increased from \$673.9 billion in 1980 to \$969.6 billion in 1990 (in terms of constant dollars) (BLS, 1991b), the workforce has declined from slightly more than 20

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 8

million to about 19 million during that period (BLS, 1991c). Consequently, industrially-generated community noise is probably no greater than it was in 1980.

From the worker's perspective the industrial noise problem is still very serious. The Occupational Safety and Health Administration has cut back on the enforcement of occupational noise standards and has allowed the substitution of hearing protection devices in lieu of engineering controls in many cases (OSHA, 1986). However, it is difficult to know whether noise levels in industry are increasing or decreasing because no comprehensive survey has been performed since the 1976 survey performed by Bolt Beranek and Newman Inc. (BBN, 1976).

6. Noise in buildings

Apartment dwellers are often annoyed by noise in their homes, especially when the building is not well designed and constructed. In this case, internal building noise from plumbing, boilers, generators, air conditioners, and fans, can be audible and annoying. Improperly insulated walls and ceilings can reveal the sound of amplified music, voices, footfalls, and noisy activities from neighboring units. External noise from emergency vehicles, traffic, refuse collection, and other city noises can be a problem for urban residents, especially when windows are open or insufficiently glazed.

Wetherill (1987) reports that although the lack of soundproofing is the most frequent environmental complaint of apartment dwellers, the knowledge to solve these problems is not being applied. In fact, the quality of construction is steadily declining, and the noise problems are getting worse (Wetherill, 1991).

7. Noise from consumer products

Certain household equipment, such as vacuum cleaners and some kitchen appliances, have been and continue to be noisemakers, although their contribution to the daily noise dose is usually not very large. Added to this list would be yard maintenance equipment, such as lawn mowers and snow blowers, which can, at least, cause disharmony with one's neighbors, and power shop tools, which can be hazardous to hearing if used for sufficient periods of time.

One example of a fairly new product is the gasoline-powered leaf blower, with average A-weighted sound levels at the operator's position of 103.6 dB, and maximum levels of 110-112 dB (Clark, 1991). In an extensive review of nonoccupational noise exposures, Davis et al. (1985) report that the manufacturers of household devices have been reluctant to release sound level information. Consequently, it could be difficult to assess the magnitude of the problem and the extent to which noise levels are increasing or decreasing.

Residents of suburban and rural areas are sometimes disturbed by recreational noise sources, such as off-road vehicles, high-powered motor boats, and snowmobiles. Some of these sources, such as snowmobiles, are not as noisy as they were more than a decade ago, due to attention to the problem by the manufacturers and their trade associations. Others are no less noisy, and possibly more so because noise seems to be generic to the sport. Example would be motorcycle and car racing, and events like "tractor pulls."

In fact, the allure of noisy recreational activities seems to be considerably greater now than it was a decade or so ago. The technology of sound reproduction has advanced to the point where loudspeakers can faithfully reproduce music and other sounds at levels well above 120 dB. Sporting events use giant digital "applause meters" to measure and display enthusiasm for the more popular team. The extreme in car stereo technology is now the "boom car", with sound levels exceeding 140 dB. (4) Activities like aerobic exercising and ice skating, as well as disco dancing, are accompanied by

(4) The International Auto Sound Challenge Association sponsors contests and gives the most points to contestants whom speakers produce the highest sound pressure levels, up to 140 dB. However, levels above that merit no more than 140 points.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 9

amplified music played at high sound levels. After summarizing the results of 16 studies of discotheques and rock concerts Clark (1991) reported the geometric mean of the measured sound levels as 103.4 dB. The trend in noise levels for these kinds of activities is definitely upward.

One of the most serious sources of recreational noise is sport shooting, where peak sound pressure levels at the ear can range from about 144 dB up to more than 170 dB (5) (Odess, 1972). In his analysis of this literature, Clark (1991) cites estimates of the number of people responding positively to questions about hunting or target shooting. These estimates range from 14 percent of the general population in Scandinavia and the U.K. (Axelsson et al., 1981; Davis et al., 1985) to nearly 50 percent in the Canadian workforce (Chung et al., 1981), which Clark found to be consistent with estimates from U.S. industry. In a population of rural schoolchildren, 45 out of 47 boys and 2 out of 21 girls reported having used guns (Kramer and Wood, 1982).

A subcategory of consumer product noise that deserves mention is noisy toys. A few toys, such as firecrackers, snappers, and cap pistols have been part of the adventurous child's experience for generations. The general assumption is that these toys do not pose a hazard when used occasionally and located at a sufficient distance from the ear (6). Nowadays, there is a large variety of noisy toys, thanks to the availability of improved technology. Many of them mimic adult noisemakers, such as amplified toy guitars, child-sized vacuum cleaners, and miniature power saws. Some of these toys generate quite high levels of sound. For example, a baby's squeeze toy (Fay, 1991) and the battery operated siren of a toy police car have both been measured at 110 dB (7).

In a recent report on noisy toys, Leroux and Laroche (1991) cite studies showing A-weighted noise levels for a toy motor at 107 dB and a child's rattle at 99-100 dB (LNE, 1973). Current Canadian legislation limits the sound output of toys to "one hundred decibels measured at the distance that the product ordinarily would be from the ear of the child using it..." (Act, 1969), but Leroux and Laroche propose that this limit be lowered to an A-weighted level of 75 dB.

C. Numbers of People Exposed to Noise

The fact that people are variously exposed to noise is not surprising. **Considering that decibels are measured on a logarithmic scale, however, the magnitude of these variations can be enormous.** For example, the average noise level outside an urban apartment can be 1,000 times more intense than in a rural residential neighborhood. Fortunately, this difference will be perceived more like an eight-fold rather than a thousand-fold increase. Figure 2, from EPA's document Protective Noise Levels, shows examples of outdoor day-night average sound levels measured at various locations (EPA, 1978).

In 1974, EPA estimated that nearly 100 million Americans lived in areas where the daily average noise levels exceeded its identified safe DNL of 55 dB (EPA, 1974a). Figure 3, from EPA's Levels Document, shows the

residential noise environment of the U.S. population as a function of the exterior DNL, with separate curves for the freeway and aircraft increments.

(5) A-weighted level. of these weapons would measure somewhat lower, with levels for .22 caliber rifles at about 132-139 dB and shotguns at 150-165 dB. (See Clark, 1991)

(6) Certain European studies, however, have reported as many as 1 percent to 3.7 percent of teenage children suffer hearing losses caused by impulsive noise from toys (Gjaevenes, 1967; Moe, 1966). Noise from cap guns, for example, can exceed peak sound pressure levels of 140 dB (Gjaevenes, 1966; Hodge and McCommons, 1966; Marshall and Brandt, 1973; all as cited by Leroux and Laroche, 1991).

(7) New York audiologist Thomas Fay has measured the noise levels of a variety of children's toys. In doing so he places the sound level meter's microphone quite close to the noise source (from 2 inches to 1/2 inch away), based on his observations of the children at play. (Personal communication, April 1991).

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 10

[Link to Figure 2](#)

[Examples of Outdoor Day-Night Average Sound Levels in dB Measured at Various Locations](#)

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 11

A few years later EPA contracted with the consulting firm Bolt Beranek and Newman (BBN) to develop more detailed estimates. The resulting report, Noise in America, includes a breakdown according to noise exposure source (EPA, 1981). Table I gives the estimated number of Americans exposed to traffic; aircraft, construction, rail, and industrial noise for various DNLs from 55 dB to 80 dB. The authors note that there will be some overlap among populations exposed to different sources, so the numbers across categories are not additive. The far right column represents the total estimated number of people exposed to the combined sources. Although the authors do not give an estimate for the number of people exposed above Ldn 55 dB, another authority puts it at 138 million at that time (Eldred, 1990).

These estimates do not represent the results of a national survey. Instead, the authors used data and models available to EPA and BBN at the time. Because of this, some categories of noise exposure are likely to be more accurate than others. They did, however, represent the best available estimates at the time, and because no efforts have been made to update them, they are the best estimates available today.

D. Summary: Noise in America

It is safe to assume that noise in communities is increasing. Noise levels are directly related to population density, and the urban population is increasing at twice the pace of the nonurban population. In addition, the last decade has seen rapid growth in air transportation, trucking, and the construction industries, indicating that noise levels from these sources has most likely increased. The fact that some of these sources have been and continue to be quieted (especially new generations of trucks and aircraft) should mitigate this increase, but the extent of this mitigation will remain unknown until some sort of national survey is performed. Noise from construction continues to be a

problem, and it appears that noise inside buildings as well as noise from recreational activities and consumer products is on the rise. Estimates of the number of people exposed to noise at various levels are now somewhat outdated.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 12

[Link to Figure 3:](#)

[Residential Noise Environment of the National Population As a Function of Exterior Day-Night Average Sound Level](#)

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 13

Table 1:

Summary of U.S. Population Exposed to Various Day-Night Average Sound Levels (or higher) From Noise Sources in the Community. (1) From *Noise in America* (EPA, 1981, pp. 10 and 15)

Estimated Number (in Millions) of People in Each Noise Category

DNL (dB)	Traffic	Aircraft	Construction (3)	Rail	Industrial	Total
>80	0.1	0.1	--	--	--	0.2
>75	1.1	0.3	0.1	--	--	1.5
>70	5.7	1.3	0.6	0.8	--	8.1
>65	19.3	4.7	2.1	2.5	0.3	27.8
>60	46.6	11.5	7.7	3.5	1.9	63.6
>55	96.8	24.5	27.5	6.0	6.9	92.4*

(1) DNL values are yearly averages, outdoors

(2) Note that there is some overlap among populations exposed to different noise sources. For example, some of the 96.8 million people exposed to Ldn 55 dB and above from traffic noise are also exposed to aircraft noise.

(3) Construction estimates include both residential and nonresidential exposure.

*Distribution of total exposed to all sources starts at Ldn 58 dB since the analysis involves combining distributions exposed to 55 dB and above.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 14

V. Effects of Noise

A. Noise-Induced Hearing Loss

Hearing loss is one of the most obvious and easily quantified effects of excessive exposure to noise. Its progression, however, is insidious, in that it usually develops slowly over a long period of time, and the impairment can reach the handicapping stage before an individual is aware of what has happened. While the losses are temporary at first, they become permanent after continued exposure, and there is no medical treatment to counteract the effect. When combined with presbycusis, hearing loss naturally occurring with the aging process, the result is a premature impairment that grows inexorably with age.

According to the U.S. Public Health Service (PHS, 1991), some 10 million of the estimated 21 million Americans with hearing impairments owe their losses to noise exposure (as cited in Carney, 1991). The study goes on to say that it is unclear whether the incidence of hearing impairment has risen in recent years because the necessary studies have not been conducted.

1. Extent of noise-induced hearing loss from environmental sources

Although the major cause of noise-induced hearing loss is occupational, substantial damage can be caused by nonoccupational sources. In addition to the frequently-blamed sources of loud music and shooting, noise-induced hearing loss has been noted in the children of farm families, presumably from the frequent use of tractors (e.g., Broste et al., 1979); general aviation pilots because of the high noise levels emitted by piston aircraft (Anon., 1982); and users of earlier generations of cordless telephones because of the placement of the ring mechanism in the earpiece (Orchik et al., 1985 and 1987).

The prevailing notion among parents is that the hearing threshold levels of children are worse than they used to be because of exposure to loud music. Actually, a recent national survey of 38,000 school children found better hearing threshold levels than 30 years ago, but blames the discrepancies on the sampling methods used in the earlier study and the conversion from an older to a newer zero reference level (Lundeen, 1991). There is, however, evidence that the hearing of some young people is being affected by noisy leisure time activities (Axelsson et al., 1987).

Loud music in particular appears to be the cause of hearing impairment and tinnitus in rock musicians. Such luminaries as Pete Townshend and Ted Nugent (8) have acquired substantial hearing losses and are now campaigning for hearing conservation (Murphy, 1989). Some studies point to a hearing hazard for attendees as well (see in Clark, 1991; Clark and Bohne, 1986; Danenberg et al., 1987).

As mentioned above, probably the greatest nonoccupational hazard to hearing comes from sport shooting. Clark (1991) cites studies of industrial workers by Chung et al. (1981), Johnson and Riffle (1982), and Prosser et al. (1988), showing significantly greater hearing losses among sport-shooters than among their nonshooting counterparts. These losses are almost always characterized by worse hearing in the left ear than the right.

The contribution from nonoccupational sources is called "sociocusis" (a contraction of "socioacusis"). Evidence from primitive societies suggests that the absence of sociocusis explains the large differences in hearing threshold level between these populations and those of the "civilized" nations (Rosen, 1962). Sociocusis, occupational hearing loss, and presbycusis contribute in various

(8) According to Nugent, who has worn an earplug in his right ear since 1967: "My left ear is there just to balance my face, because it doesn't work at all." (Murphy 1989)

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 15

proportion to an individual's total hearing impairment. While the contribution of each source may be less than significant, the combination of all three can be enough to produce a handicapping condition. As longevity in the U.S. population increases, the toll of noise-induced hearing loss will become increasingly evident (Carney, 1991).

2. The handicap of noise-induced hearing loss

Vowel sounds tend to be low in frequency and high in sound energy, while the consonants are much higher in frequency and have considerably less amplitude. It also happens that consonants provide the primary intelligibility to speech. Because noise damages the ear's ability to perceive high-frequency sounds much earlier and more severely than the low-frequency sounds, individuals with noise-induced hearing loss are at a particular disadvantage in understanding speech.

Individuals with early noise-induced hearing loss often think that other people no longer speak clearly. They soon begin to notice that they have difficulty understanding speech when there is noise in the background, and in groups of people, and that it is hard to identify which person is talking. As the hearing loss progresses, these individuals avoid social occasions and situations where they must listen at a distance, like church and theater. The eventual result can be loneliness and isolation.

3. The study of noise-induced hearing loss

Noise damages the delicate sensory cells of the inner ear, the cochlea. This process can be studied in the laboratory by inducing temporary shifts in hearing threshold level in humans. Over recent years the preferred method of investigation is to produce temporary and permanent threshold shifts in animals, and to study the resulting physiological and anatomical changes in the cochlea, as well as shifts in hearing threshold level. The laboratory allows for strict control of noise level and duration, but the durations are usually relatively short because of the time and expense involved. Also there is some controversy over the extent to which the results can be generalized to humans.

Much of the recent laboratory effort in noise research has focused on the structural and functional basis of noise-induced hearing loss, which has been greatly aided by the electron microscope. Investigators have identified the sensory cell's stereocilia and the rootlets which anchor them as the auditory system's most vulnerable components with respect to noise exposure (Liberman, 1990).

Field studies of noise-exposed workers avoid the problems of species generalization, and the exposure durations can be over many decades. They are usually cross-sectional studies, however, meaning that the current hearing threshold levels are related to noise exposures that have been experienced over many years. Although the current noise measurements may be valid, their validity over prior years usually has to be assumed without benefit of precise data.

4. Risk of hearing impairment from continuous noise

The methods and results of the major field studies of continuous noise exposure conducted in the late 1960s and early 1970s remain unchallenged. Examples are the studies of Burns and Robinson (1970), Baughn (1973), Passchier-Vermeer (1968), and the U.S. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH, 1973).

Data from these studies have been used by various organizations to estimate the risk of hearing impairment over a working lifetime of exposure to noise. These types of studies have also been used by the EPA to estimate the hazard of nonoccupational noise (Guignard, 1973; Johnson, 1973; EPA, 1973a). The data cited above of Burns and Robinson, Baughn, and Passchier-Vermeer went into EPA's identification of a yearly average exposure level of 70 dB as the safe level, which could be experienced over a lifetime (EPA, 1974a) (9).

(9) The 70-dB 24-hour average sound level can be interpreted as a 75-dB 8-hour average sound level plus an average sound level during the other 16 hours of less than 60 dB (see EPA's Levels Document, p.29, footnote d).

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 16

A new international standard (ISO, 1989), which is based mainly on the data of Passchier-Vermeer and Burns and Robinson, contains formulas for assessing the risk of noise-induced hearing impairment and handicap: using either a highly screened (for nonoccupational hearing loss) or an unscreened population as a control group. The data and analyses found in these major studies have not been seriously challenged, and remain in use today.

5. Varying and intermittent noise

There has been some debate over the best rule for combining noise level and duration to assess the damaging effects of noise, especially varying and intermittent noise. This relationship is often called the doubling rate, or nowadays, the exchange rate. The EPA, as well as most other federal agencies (and most European countries, the United Kingdom, some Canadian provinces) use the equal-energy rule, which incorporates a 3-dB exchange rate. OSHA uses the 5-dB exchange rate, and the U.S. Air Force, uses 4 dB. None of these rules makes any provisions for the temporal order of sounds, although the 5-dB exchange rate supposedly represents a simplification of criteria that take a certain number of intermittencies into account. (10)

Investigations of the relationship between noise level and duration have been conducted over recent years using laboratory animals. The results have confirmed the validity of the equal energy (3-dB) rule for single exposures to continuous noise (Bohne and Pearse, 1982; Ward and Turner, 1982), or when the exposures are broken up into 8-hour, or even 1-hour "workdays", 5 days per week, so long as the sound energy is equivalent (Ward, 1983). There is, however, some benefit to intermittent quiet periods (Ward and Turner, 1982), during which the ear can recover from small, temporary hearing losses. For this reason EPA has adjusted its identified safe level upward by 5 dB (11) since most environmental noise exposures are intermittent in nature. EPA's use of the equal-energy rule and the 5-dB adjustment have not been seriously challenged.

6. Impulse noise

The effects of impulse noise have been studied extensively over recent years, but there is less agreement on this topic than there is for continuous and intermittent noise. Although there was consensus favoring the 3-dB rule at a 1981 international meeting in England (von Gierke et al., 1981), actual dose-response relationships are still elusive. The effects of impulse noise do not always follow the 3-dB rule, in that temporal pattern, waveform, and rise time can affect the growth of hearing loss, despite constancy of sound energy (Henderson and Hamernik, 1986).

Frequency also has some bearing on the damage caused by impulse noise, in that low-frequency impulses produce significantly less damage than sounds in the mid-to-high-frequency range (Price, 1983). The ear appears to be most susceptible to impulses with peaks around 4,000 Hz (Price, 1989). Also, there may be a critical level, above which the ear is considerably more at risk because of a change in the response mechanism. On the basis of his research, Price (1981) has suggested a critical level of 145 dB, with a standard deviation of 8 dB.

7. Susceptibility

Evidence from field studies indicates that men incur more hearing loss than women from comparable noise exposures (Burns and Robinson, 1970; Berger et al., 1978; Royster et al., 1980), and that Caucasians appear to be more susceptible than Blacks to noise-induced hearing loss (Royster et al., 1980). Other factors, such as age, preexposure hearing threshold level, general health, and use of alcohol, have not yet proved to be reliable predictors of susceptibility (Ward, 1986), although

(10) The 5-dB rule does not necessarily provide for intermittencies because it allows uninterrupted exposures to continuous noise at high levels. See Suter 1983.

(11) The identified safe level of 70 dB reflects the incorporation of the 5-dB adjustment.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 17

there is some indication that the use of tobacco may increase susceptibility to noise-induced hearing loss (Barone, et al., 1987; Stark, et al., 1988).

8. Interactions with other agents

Noise can interact with drugs and industrial agents to produce additive or even synergistic effects on hearing. As expected, the higher the levels of noise and the greater the dose of the other agent, the greater will be the resulting hearing loss. The ototoxic properties of certain drugs, most notably the aminoglycoside antibiotics (the "mycin" drugs), are heightened by exposure to noise. Numerous studies of kanamycin plus noise exposure have revealed additive and some synergistic results (Humes, 1984). High doses of salicylates (aspirin) accompanied by noise exposure can produce temporary hearing losses (McFadden and Plattsmier, 1983), but permanent losses do not seem to occur. Cisplatin, used in cancer chemotherapy, is known to be toxic to the auditory system, and has been shown to interact significantly with noise exposure (Boettcher et al., 1989).

A variety of industrial agents, which can be potent neurotoxins, have been shown to be capable of producing hearing loss (Fechter, 1989). These agents include heavy metals, such as lead and mercury, organic solvents, such as toluene, xylene, and carbon disulfide, and an asphyxiant, carbon monoxide.

9. Hearing protectors

As its first (and only) labeling regulation, EPA promulgated a regulation for labeling the attenuation of hearing protection devices (EPA, 1979). The standard required manufacturers to subject their hearing protectors to specific laboratory tests, and to publish a "Noise Reduction Rating" (NRR) on the product's package. The NRR was subsequently adopted by OSHA in its hearing conservation amendment, which required employers to use it in assessing the adequacy of hearing protectors for given noise environments (OSHA, 1981 and 1983). Recent research shows that the NRR greatly overestimates the noise reduction to be achieved by these devices in actual field use. (12) These kinds of findings have led to the formation of a new ANSI working group to investigate alternatives to the current NRR (Berger et al. 1990), and the recommendation that EPA revise its existing labeling regulation (Berger, 1991; Stewart, 1991).

10. Summary: Noise-induced hearing loss

Noise-induced hearing loss is probably the most well-defined of the effects of noise. Predictions of hearing loss from various levels of continuous and varying noise have been extensively researched and are no longer

controversial. Some discussion still remains on the extent to which intermittencies ameliorate the adverse effects on hearing and the exact nature of dose-response relationships from impulse noise. It appears that some members of the population are somewhat more susceptible to noise-induced hearing loss than others, and there is a growing body of evidence that certain drugs and chemicals can enhance the auditory hazard from noise.

Although the incidence of noise-induced hearing loss from industrial populations is more extensively documented, there is growing evidence of hearing loss from leisure time activities, especially from sport shooting, but also from loud music, noisy toys, and other manifestations of our "civilized" society. Because of the increase in exposure to recreational noise, the hazard from these sources needs to be more thoroughly evaluated. Finally, the recent evidence that hearing protective devices do not perform in actual use the way laboratory tests would imply, lends support to the need for reevaluating current methods of assessing hearing protector attenuation.

(12) In a summary of 10 studies, Berger (1983) shows that most hearing protectors in the field provide only one-third to one-half the attenuation that they do in the laboratory.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 18

B. Interference With Communication

Noise can mask important sounds and disrupt communication between individuals in a variety of settings. This process can cause anything from a slight irritation to a serious safety hazard involving an accident or even a fatality because of the failure to hear the warning sounds of imminent danger. Such warning sounds can include the approach of a rapidly moving motor vehicle, or the sound of malfunctioning machinery. For example, Aviation Safety (Anon., 1982), states that hundreds of accident reports have many "say again" exchanges between pilots and controllers, although neither side reports anything wrong with the radios.

Noise can disrupt face-to-face and telephone conversation, and the enjoyment of radio and television in the home. It can also disrupt effective communication between teachers and pupils in schools, and can cause fatigue and vocal strain in those who need to communicate in spite of the noise. Interference with communication has proved to be one of the most important components of noise-related annoyance (EPA, 1974a).

In its Levels Document, EPA determined that a yearly average day-night sound level of 45 dB would permit adequate speech communication in the home, and a DNL of 55 dB would permit normal communication outdoors at a distance of about 3 meters. (13) These levels also apply to hospitals and educational facilities. Higher average noise levels would be satisfactory for certain nonresidential spaces, such as commercial and industrial facilities, and inside transportation, depending on the degree to which speech communication is critical. Research over the last 20 years has expanded and refined EPA's criteria development in this area, but has not generated any major changes.

1. Prediction of speech interference

Methods of predicting the amount of speech that can be communicated in various noise backgrounds have been available for decades. Probably the most popular and respected method is the articulation index (AI) (French and Steinberg, 1947), which requires the measurement or estimation of the spectrum level of both speech and noise in 20 contiguous bands. Over the past 2 decades investigators have suggested adjustments to the AI for 113-octave bands, reverberation time, various vocal efforts, etc., and more recently for various degrees of hearing impairment (Humes, et al., 1986 and 1987).

The speech interference level (SIL) (Beranek, 1954) provides a quick method for estimating the distance at which communication can occur for different levels of vocal effort. The current method involves measuring octave-band

sound pressure levels at 500, 1,000, 2,000, and 4,000 Hz and referring to a chart to determine the die potential communication distance. The basic chart has been expanded to include such parameters as a broader range of voice levels and provisions for room reverberation (Webster, 1983). Additions to both the AI and the SIL have been proposed by Lazarus (1990), who offers modifications and extensions to account for strain on the part of both talker and listener, and the wearing of hearing protectors.

Another popular method to predict speech communication in a variety of conditions, the speech transmission index (STI), has been developed by a Netherlands research group (Houtgast, 1980; Houtgast and Steeneken, 1983). The STI takes into account room volume and reverberation time, in addition to speech and noise levels, and distance between talker and listener. A more recent outgrowth, the rapid speech transmission index (RASTI), represents a simplified version of the STI intended for field use, and is available in an instrument conforming to an international standard (IEC, 1987).

(13) These levels represent EPA's identification of safe levels of environmental noise to protect the public health and welfare against all adverse effects of noise with the exception of hearing loss.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 19

Finally the sound level meter's A-weighting network can be successfully used to predict speech interference levels. It is easy to use, available on virtually all sound level meters, and effective when the noise spectra are not complex.

2. Criteria for speech and warning signals

In addition to the classic work of Beranek and his colleagues (Beranek et al., 1971), Beranek has recently refined the traditional curves to account for the annoyance due to low-frequency "rumble" (Beranek, 1989). New criteria for determining acceptable background levels of noise in rooms are also offered by Lazarus (1986a, 1986b, 1987, and 1990). Lazarus includes in his criteria a variety of parameters such as: type of room, type of communication, communication distance, vocal effort, quality of speech intelligibility, AI, communication strain, listener's hearing sensitivity, and the use of hearing protectors.

Guidelines for audible warning signals have been developed by Patterson (1982). These guidelines, which were originally created for civil aircraft, were later adapted to helicopters and even stationary workplaces like hospitals (Patterson, 1985; Rood et al., 1985). Another set of guidelines for acoustic warning signals has been developed by Lazarus and Hoge (1986), and are based on the compatibility of signal type with various desired or undesired situations.

Although criteria have not yet been developed for speech recognition involving nonnative listeners, experiments by Florentine (1985) and Nabelek (1983) indicate that these individuals need more favorable listening conditions (less background noise and reverberation) than their native-language counterparts. These findings have implications for air traffic control systems.

3. The effect of hearing protectors on speech and warning signal perception

Hearing protectors attenuate both noise and the desired signal by equal amounts in a given frequency band, reducing both to levels where the ear is less likely to distort. This process often improves speech recognition when the level of background noise exceeds 80 to 90 dB. However, because hearing protectors usually provide considerably more attenuation in the high frequencies than in the low frequencies, listeners who have high-frequency hearing losses are at a disadvantage. Many speech sounds and some warning signals will be attenuated beyond the range of audibility. This is especially true of individuals whose losses exceed an average of 30 dB at the audiometric frequencies 2000, 3000, and 4000 Hz (Lindeman, 1976). A potential solution for this problem lies

in some newly developed hearing protectors with flat attenuation across the frequency spectrum (Allen and Berger, 1990; Killion et al., 1988). One type of these protectors has already become popular with orchestral musicians (Killion et al., 1988) and even some rock musicians (Cohen, 1990).

Individuals tend to speak more softly when they wear hearing protectors, and consequently, speech communication is degraded when both talker and listener wear these devices (Hoermann et al., 1984). Hearing protectors also interfere with the localization of sounds in space, and this is especially true of the ability to localize sounds in the vertical plane while wearing ear muffs (Noble, 1981). Both ear plugs and ear muffs cause these types of problems, but it appears that they are more pronounced with ear muffs (Howell and Martin, 1975; Abel et al., 1982). These findings can have serious implications for safety in some circumstances.

4. Scholastic performance

Noise can disrupt communication in the classroom to the extent that the instructional method used in schools close to airports is sometimes nicknamed "jet pause" teaching. Cohen and Weinstein (1981) have reviewed several studies, which, after controlling for socioeconomic factors, indicate that the academic performance of children in quiet schools is better than that of children in noisy schools.

 Top

Return to NPC Library

Return to NPC Home Page

Page 20

For example, elementary school children on the side of a school facing train tracks. performed more poorly on a reading achievement test than children in classrooms on the quiet side of the school (Bronzaft and McCarthy, 1975). (14) Cohen and Weinstein also discuss research showing that skills, such as auditory discrimination and reading achievement can be adversely affected when children live in noisy circumstances, even though their schools may be no noisier than average. These latter studies indicate that interference with communication in the classroom is not the only process at work here. Possible additional explanations include adverse effects on children's information processing strategies and their feelings of personal control (15) (Cohen and Weinstein, 1981).

5. Summary: Interference with communication

Interference with speech communication and other sounds is one of the most salient components of noise-induced annoyance. The resulting disruption can constitute anything from an annoyance to a serious safety hazard, depending on the circumstance.

Research over the past 2 decades has expanded and refined methods for predicting communication interference, but has not produced any major changes. Numerous adjustments have been suggested for the AI, the SIL has been modified and refined, and a new predictive method, the STI has been added. Criteria for determining acceptable background levels in rooms have also been expanded and refined, and progress has been made on the development of effective acoustic warning signals.

It is now clear that hearing protection devices can interfere with the perception of speech and warning signals, especially when the listener is hearing impaired, both talker and listener wear the devices, and when wearers attempt to locate a signal's source.

Noise can interfere with the educational process, and the result has been dubbed "jet-pause teaching" around some of the nation's noisier airports, but railroad and traffic noise can also produce scholastic decrements.

C. Effects of Noise on Sleep

ES
use

Noise is one of the most common forms of sleep disturbance, and sleep disturbance is a critical component of noise-related annoyance. A study used by EPA in preparing the Levels Document showed that sleep interference was the most frequently cited activity disrupted by surface vehicle noise (BBN, 1971). Aircraft noise can also cause sleep disruption, especially in recent years with the escalation of nighttime operations by the air cargo industry. When sleep disruption becomes chronic, its adverse effects on health and well-being are well-known.

1. Assessing sleep disturbance

Noise can cause the sleeper to awaken repeatedly and to report poor sleep quality the next day, but noise can also produce reactions of which the individual is unaware. These reactions include changes from heavier to lighter stages of sleep, reductions in "rapid eye movement" (REM) sleep, increases in body movements during the night, changes in cardiovascular responses, and mood changes and performance decrements the next day. The accuracy and efficiency with which these effects are measured has been greatly assisted by the use of contemporary computers. The most popular measurement tool nowadays is electro-encephalography, but other methods, such as

(14) Bronzaft reported that in 1978 the city of New York reduced the noise of the elevated train and installed acoustical insulation in the affected classrooms, providing a total reduction in the A-weighted noise level of 6 to 8 dB (Bronzaft, 1981). By 1981, there was essentially no difference in reading achievement between students on the two sides of the school for the classroom studied.

(15) See also the discussion of noise, performance, and behavior in sections D.4, and D.5. below.

Top

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 21

electrocardiography, electromyography, and electrooculography are also used, as well as clinical observation, self-assessment surveys, and accelerometry to measure the motion of the bed frame.

ES
use

As a result of many years of research on the effects of noise on sleep, it is clear that intermittent and impulsive noise is more disturbing than continuous noise of equivalent energy, and that meaningful sounds are more likely to produce sleep disruption than sounds with neutral content. Also, older people are more likely to have their sleep disturbed by noise than younger people. In fact, children appear to be about 10 dB less sensitive to noise-induced sleep disruption than adults (Eberhardt, 1990). Sleep disturbance from noise tends to be greater in the early hours of the morning, when individuals spend more time in lighter sleep stages, and this is particularly true of the elderly.

2. Criteria for sleep interference

In the Levels Document EPA identified an indoor DNL of 45 dB, which translates to a nighttime average sound level of 35 dB, as necessary to protect against sleep interference. However, consensus on the levels of noise that can be tolerated without sleep disruption is incomplete at this time. In an attempt to develop a quantitative model for predicting noise-induced sleep interference, Pearsons et al., (1989) reviewed and analyzed 21 studies. However, the authors there unable to derive dose-response relationships from these studies because of large discrepancies between studies conducted in the laboratory and those conducted in the field.

In a recent review of the noise and sleep research, Griefahn (1990) recommends that the nighttime average sound level be kept below 45 dB in the sleeper's quarters. She cites research by Eberhardt (1987 and 1990; Eberhardt et al., 1987;) and Vallet et al., (1976 and 1990) showing self-reported adverse effects from continual road traffic when the average sound level is 40 dB and physiological responses at an average level of 37 dB. For intermittent road traffic noise, maximum recommended levels for single events (as opposed to average levels) range from 45 to 68 dB, depending on the investigation (Griefahn, 1990). Vallet et al. (1990), recommend maximum outside levels of 65 dB, which, of course, relies on some attenuation by the residence. Griefahn also points out that higher

maximum levels can be tolerated if the ambient noise level is not very low, and that the difference between single events and the ambient level should not exceed 8 to 10 dB.

3. After-effects and habituation

Numerous recent investigations have revealed after-effects due to noisy nights. Ohrstrom (1983) found mood changes on the day following nights when the average sound level was as low as 35 dB. Adverse effects on performance, such as increased reaction time, have also been measured (Jurriens et al., 1983), and it appears that older peoples' next day performance is more adversely affected by noise than that of younger people (Griefahn and Gros, 1983).

Although people often believe they get used to nighttime noise, physiological tests point to the contrary. Studies have shown that while the subjective response improves with time, cardiovascular responses remain unchanged (Muzet, 1983). Vallet et al. (1990) conclude that habituation is not complete, even after 5 years of exposure to noise.

4. Summary: Effects of noise on sleep

Noise-induced sleep interference is one of the critical components of community annoyance. It can produce short-term adverse effects, such as mood changes and decrements in task performance the next day, with the possibility of more serious effects on health and well-being if it continues over long periods.

EPA's identified indoor DNL of 45 dB has not been seriously challenged over the past decade, but consensus in this area is lacking. One problem is that different experimenters tend to use a

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 22

variety of descriptors (DNL, Leq, and maximum single-event levels) and a variety of methods for evaluating the effects (EEG, EKG, self-report, etc.). Perhaps one reason for the lack of clear-cut criteria is that this a complex area to research, requiring considerable time and expense. Another is, of course, a need for more field studies in this area.

D. Effects on Performance and Behavior

EPA did not use the literature on the effects of noise on performance and behavior in the identification of its levels of noise to protect against activity interference. One reason may have been that much of the information at that time related to the occupational setting rather than the general environment. Another may have been the complexity of the topic and the difficulty involved in identifying a single noise level that could apply to a great variety of tasks and conditions. Although these difficulties still pertain, much research has been generated in this area over recent years. (16)

Noise can cause adverse effects on task performance and behavior at work, and in nonoccupational and social settings. These effects are the subject of some controversy, however, since they do not always occur as predicted. Sometimes noise actually improves performance, and sometimes there are no measurable differences between performance in noisy and quiet conditions. The presence and degree of effects depends on a variety of intervening variables.

1. Sensory and motor effects

Experiments on the effects of noise on vision have produced conflicting results, with the suggestion of some effects on visual discrimination (Cohen, 1977). There is evidence, however, that high levels of noise can produce shifts in visual field (Parker, et al., 1976, 1978). High levels of noise can affect vestibular function, especially when the presentation to the two ears is asymmetrical, (or the level of attenuation is greater in one ear) (Harris, 1968). Impulsive or other sudden loud sounds can produce a startle response that does not completely habituate with repeated, predictable exposures (May and Rice, 1971).

2. Noise variables

Sound level is one of the most important parameters when predicting performance effects. The level of noise necessary to produce adverse effects is greatly dependent upon the type of task. Simple tasks remain unaffected at noise levels as high as 115 dB or above, while more complex tasks are disrupted at much lower levels. Until fairly recently, the level of beginning effects was thought to be around 95 dB for most conditions, but a summary of recent research (Jones, 1990) points to effects at much lower levels. Effects on serial reaction tasks have been noted for continuous noise with C- weighted noise levels of 90 dB (Jones, 1983) and for intermittent noise with C-weighted levels of around 80 dB (Lahtela et al., 1986).

Frequency and temporal characteristics also play a part. High-frequency sound is more disruptive than low-frequency sound, and intermittent noise can affect performance more adversely than continuous noise of equivalent energy. Aperiodic intermittencies are more likely to produce adverse effects than regular ones, and impulse noise may be even more disruptive. Again the effects are variable, depending upon task complexity and other factors.

(16) For a comprehensive review of the effects of noise on job performance, see Suter, 1989.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 23

Much of the important research in the effects of noise on performance conducted over the last decade has focused on the effects of irrelevant speech. (17) The adverse effects of irrelevant speech appear to be fairly independent of sound level, at least in the 55-95 dB range, and therefore, are not mitigated simply by attenuating them by 10 dB or so (Jones, 1990). It also appears that irrelevant speech affects processes involving memory (e.g., reasoning, mental arithmetic, and problem solving) rather than attention. With respect to reading tasks, however, meaningful speech is more disruptive than meaningless speech (Jones, 1990). These findings have significance for many modern work and school environments, where information processing and exchange is so important, especially those of the "open plan" variety.

3. Task variables

Task complexity has been identified in numerous experiments as a crucial determinant of the effects of noise on performance. Noise exposure usually leaves simple routine tasks unaffected, and can even improve performance of monotonous tasks, presumably by elevating one's level of arousal (Broadbent, 1971). Some tasks, such as tracking and jobs requiring intellectual function, can be momentarily disrupted without decrements in overall performance (Broadbent, 1979). But if the noise level is sufficiently high or if the task becomes more complex, noise will have an adverse effect. When two or more tasks must be performed simultaneously in a noisy environment, performance on the primary task usually remains unaffected, while performance on the subsidiary task deteriorates (Hockey and Hamilton, 1970; Davies and Jones, 1975; Finkleman and Glass, 1970).

4. After-effects

It seems that noise can have even greater effects after than during exposure. The most common after-effect appearing in the experimental literature is a reduced tolerance for frustration, manifested in a series of experiments as a reduction in willingness to persist in trying to solve insoluble puzzles (Glass and Singer, 1972; Percival and Loeb, 1980). This research also indicates that predictability of the noise signal greatly reduces its adverse after-effects (Glass and Singer, 1972). One study found that the type of noise also influenced the after-effect. Aircraft noise modified to produce sudden onsets and offsets resulted in a lower tolerance for frustration after the exposure than white noise that had been similarly modified (Percival and Loeb, 1980).

5. Effects of noise on social behavior

There is an extensive literature concerning the effect of noise on social behavior, and just a few examples of this research will be discussed here. Singer et al. (1990) point out that noise has been used as a noxious stimulus in a variety of investigations because it produces the same biological and psychological effects as other stressors. In fact, they observe that the effects of noise combined with perceived control have been frequently demonstrated, and these investigations have also been extended to many other situations where the presence of control reliably moderates the effects of stress. (18)

In a frequently-cited laboratory study, Matthews and Cannon (1975) found that fewer subjects were willing to help someone who had "accidentally" dropped materials when background noise levels were 85 dB than when they were 65 dB. In a subsequent field study, the same results were demonstrated in a background of lawn mower noise, and this time the addition of a cast on the "victim's" arm enhanced helping behavior under quiet conditions, but failed to do so during the noise episodes (Matthews and Cannon, 1975). In another such experiment, Sauser et al. (1978) found that subjects recommended lower salaries for fictitious employees when exposed to A-weighted levels of

(17) The initial work was performed by Salame and Baddeley (1982, 1983, and 1987), and has been summarized by Jones (1990) at a recent conference in Stockholm.

(18) Singer et al. (1990) cite the research of Langer and Rodin on the effects of patient control in a nursing home situation.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 24

office noise at 70 to 80 dB than in quiet. Broadbent (1979 and 1983) cites additional evidence suggesting that subjects will give each other increased amounts of shock and noise when they themselves are exposed to noise, and also cites evidence that noise increases anxiety levels (Broadbent, 1983).

As mentioned above, the presence of control, or even perceived control, is one of the most important predictors of adverse behavioral effects. Subjects who perceive that they have control over the noise show significantly greater tolerance for frustration than subjects without control, even if the control is never exercised (Glass and Singer, 1972). In a recent experiment, Singer and his colleagues found that subjects who were told that they had control of an A-weighted, 103-dB noise stimulus showed significantly greater persistence on a difficult task than subjects who had no control or subjects that had control for only part of the experiment (Singer et al., 1990). This finding occurred despite the fact that the subjects with only partial control reported feelings of control no different from those with full control. To the extent that these findings can be generalized to populations living in noisy areas, this kind of research may have significant sociological implications.

6. Summary: Effects on performance and behavior

Noise can adversely affect task performance in a variety of circumstances. In the past, research in this area has focused mainly on the occupational setting, where noise levels must be sufficiently high and the task sufficiently complex for performance decrements to occur. Recent research implicates more moderate noise levels, especially when speech is the disruptive noise stimulus. Some research indicates that noise can also produce disruptive after-effects, commonly manifested as a reduced tolerance for frustration, and it appears that the presence and timing of control over the noise are critical to the prediction of after-effects. Even moderate noise levels can increase anxiety, decrease the incidence of helping behavior, and increase the risk of hostile behavior in experimental subjects. These effects may, to some extent, help explain the "dehumanization" of today's urban environment.

E. Extra-Auditory Health Effects

Noise has been implicated in the development or exacerbation of a variety of health problems, ranging from hypertension to psychosis. Some of these findings are based on carefully controlled laboratory or field research, but many others are the products of studies that have been severely criticized by the research community. In either case, obtaining valid data can be very difficult because of the myriad of intervening variables that must be controlled, such as age, selection bias, preexisting health conditions, diet, smoking habits, alcohol consumption, **socioeconomic status**, exposure to other agents, and environmental and social stressors. Additional difficulties lie in the interpretation of the findings, especially those involving acute effects. For example, if noise raises blood pressure on a temporary basis, will prolonged exposure produce permanent changes? In cases where these effects are permanent but slight, what are the long-term implications? These types of questions and problems have caused this particular area of noise research and criteria development to be very controversial.

1. Theoretical basis

Noise is considered a nonspecific biological stressor, eliciting a response that prepares the body for action, sometimes referred to as the "fight or flight" response. The physiological mechanism thought to be responsible for this reaction is the stimulation by noise (via the auditory system) of the brain's reticular activating system (Cohen, 1977). Neural impulses spread from the reticular system to the higher cortex and throughout the central nervous system. Noise can, therefore, influence

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 25

perceptual, motor, and cognitive behavior, and also trigger glandular, cardiovascular, and gastrointestinal changes by means of the autonomic nervous system. Evidence of these effects, however, is not easy to come by. Despite decades of research and probably hundreds of studies, relatively little can be said with much confidence.

2. Effects on blood pressure

Probably the most attention has been directed toward cardiovascular effects, especially potential elevations in blood pressure. Many studies of the stressful effects of noise have been conducted on rodents and other laboratory animals. The advantage of these studies is that they offer a greater degree of control and it is possible to have longer exposures than with human subjects. The disadvantages are that there is difficulty generalizing to humans, especially with the smaller animals, the expense involved when larger animals are used, and the prevailing public sentiment against animal experimentation.

EPA sponsored one of the most notable animal studies of noise exposure, in which Peterson and his colleagues performed five sets of experiments on the cardiovascular effects of noise on monkeys (Peterson et al., 1978, 1981, and 1983). The stimulus consisted of A-weighted levels of workplace noise at 85 to 90 dB, and the exposures there as long as 9 months. The results showed significant elevations of both systolic and diastolic blood pressure the fact that these changes persisted long after exposure cessation argues for a chronic effect, at least in this case.

Unfortunately, an attempt to replicate this experiment with another primate model was discontinued for lack of funding after only two subjects had been exposed (Turkkan, et al., 1983). Relatively few animal experiments have been conducted in this area over recent years.

With respect to laboratory investigations involving human subjects, Rehm (1983) cites six studies showing increases in blood pressure, but questions whether these effects would be permanent. In an attempt to identify more susceptible populations, Michalak et al. (1990) investigated the effects of low-flying aircraft on elderly subjects. Using recorded aircraft sounds, they found significant increases in both systolic and diastolic blood pressure after exposure to the two types of noise, with significantly greater response to the rapid-onset flyover noise. Whether or not these increases would become permanent with protracted exposure is not known.

Field studies of noise and blood pressure among workers or community residents are becoming increasingly popular, but the results are not always consistent. Rehm (1983) has reviewed 14 field studies, mostly of occupational noise exposure, and reports that the majority showed significant increases in either systolic or diastolic blood pressure, or both. Van Dijk et al. (1983), however, reports that six other studies of exposure to occupational noise found no significant differences between exposed and nonexposed groups.

Knipschild and Oudshoorn (1977) avoided some of the pitfalls characteristic of epidemiological studies by examining a population near the Amsterdam airport before and after an increase in exposure to aircraft noise, and comparing it to a nonexposed population nearby. The dependent variable was the purchase of certain prescription drugs: tranquilizers, sleeping pills, antacids, and cardiovascular drugs. The investigators found that the use of these drugs in the nonnoise area was essentially stable, whereas the use of most types of these drugs in the area newly impacted by noise increased steadily over the years investigated. This increase was especially noticeable for antihypertensive drugs.

In a more recent review, van Dijk (1990) analyzed 12 cross-sectional studies, with half of them showing a positive relation between noise exposure and blood pressure, and the others no significant effects. Van Dijk criticizes these kinds of investigations for the following kinds of weaknesses: inadequate description of noise and blood pressure measurements; absence or inadequate control of intervening variables; use of hearing loss as a determinant of exposure magnitude; use of hearing protectors; and questionable interpretation of the results. Part of the problem may be that the investigators often come from only one discipline, when, in fact, a multi-disciplinary team is needed.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 26

Thompson and Fidell (1990) recommend the use of prospective or case-control models, rather than the more convenient cross-sectioned study, and they stress the importance of adequate sample size. They maintain that because any changes in blood pressure resulting from community noise are likely to be small, careful controls, large sample sizes, and at least 5 years of exposure to noise would be needed to identify significant effects.

3. Effects on blood chemistry

Blood chemistry is also of interest in studies of noise exposure and the cardiovascular system. In the review cited above, Rehm (1983) reports on a series of experiments, both laboratory and field, which show increased levels of the catecholamines epinephrine and norepinephrine. Among them are the series of experiments by Ising and his colleagues (1981a, 1981b, 1981c), showing a connection between noise exposure and magnesium metabolism and humans and animals. According to Rehm, this finding suggests a possible mechanism for cardiovascular effects in that a chronic magnesium imbalance can lead to increased intracellular levels of calcium (in the heart, for instance), which, in turn, can cause vasoconstriction and increases the sensitization for catecholamines.

A large epidemiological study, the Caerphilly and Speedwell Heart Disease Study in England, holds some promise for investigating the effects of road traffic noise (Babisch and Gallacher, 1990). This study of heart disease and a variety of environmental factors uses both the cross-sectional and prospective approaches, and should continue for more than 10 years. The investigators have performed detailed noise exposure measurements. Sample sizes of more than 2000 men have been drawn from both the Caerphilly and Speedwell communities, and controls for age, socio-economic factors, family history, body weight, smoking habits, alcohol, and physical activity have been instituted. Initial results (from the cross-sectional study) indicate significant noise related elevations of serum cholesterol and glucose levels, and plasma viscosity, with an absence of significance for blood pressure or any of the other cardiovascular risk factors. The authors point out that all of the effects there slight, but even small increases, should they prove to be real, would be relevant to the public health.

4. Interactions

Several investigators have suggested that aversion to noise may be more highly correlated with health problems than the noise itself. For example, a study by Rehm (1983) found a significant correlation between noise annoyance and cardiovascular disorders. Her data also suggest that those with existing health problems are more annoyed by environmental factors, such as noise. Similarly, Rovekamp (1983) found that subjects who described themselves as sensitive to noise showed significantly greater noise-induced increases in peripheral vasoconstriction than their "normal" counterparts. Finally, a recent study of road traffic and aircraft noise failed to show a significant increase in blood pressure resulting from noise, but did show a correlation between the presence of noise and subjective health complaints (Pulles et al., 1990). Differences in effects between noise and non-noise groups there dependent upon the subjects' perceived control over the noise, but independent of noise level.

5. Other adverse effects

Adverse health effects from noise exposure other than cardiovascular effects are even more difficult to isolate. Several studies have investigated the effects of noise on fetal development, with inconclusive results. Some have shown an indication of reduced birth weight or an increase in premature births, but the effects are usually slight, and (except in one case, McDonald et al., 1988), not statistically significant (Rehm and Jansen, 1978; Knipschild et al., 1981).

The effects of noise on documented mental health disorders are likewise inconclusive. Rehm (1990) cites a series of studies showing increased numbers of psychoneurotic and psychosomatic

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 27

complaints due to noise exposure, but whether or not these complaints lead to chronic disfunction or illness is not obvious.

6. Summary: Extra-auditory effects

As a biological stressor, noise can influence the entire physiological system. Most effects appear to be transitory, but with continued exposure some effects have been shown to be chronic in laboratory animals. Probably the strongest evidence lies in the cardiovascular effects. However, many studies show adverse effects, while many others show no significant differences between experimental and control populations.

Undoubtedly because of the lack of consistent evidence in thin area, EPA could not use data on extra-auditory health effects in its identification of safe levels of environmental noise. Instead, this subject was relegated to a brief discussion in an appendix in the Levels Document. Although considerable attention was devoted to this topic at the international conference in Yugoslavia, and some coverage was given in the 1973 Criteria Document, the evidence

was far from sufficient and much too complex to enable the formulation of dose-response relationships. Later, EPA did fund some promising research in this area (Hattis and Richardson, 1980; Peterson et al., 1978, 1981, 1983; Turkkan, 1983), some of which has clearly demonstrated adverse cardiovascular effects at noise levels typical of occupational settings.

In the interim, there has been considerable European research activity in this area, but nearly 20 years later, criteria are still lacking. What is available, however, should give public policymakers as well as noise producers some reason for concern, especially in situations where those impacted by the noise have no control over or perceive they have no control over their exposures.

F. Annoyance

Annoyance is the measured outcome of a community's response to survey questions on various environmental and other factors, such as noise exposure. Although annoyance in individuals is sometimes measured in the laboratory, field evaluations of community annoyance are most useful for predicting the consequences of planned actions involving highways, airports, road traffic, railroads, or other noise sources. Factors directly affecting annoyance from noise include interference with communication and sleep disturbance, which have been discussed in earlier sections. Other less direct effects are disruption of one's peace of mind, the enjoyment of one's property, and the enjoyment of solitude. The consequences of noise-induced annoyance are privately felt dissatisfaction, publicly expressed complaints to authorities, and potential adverse health effects, as suggested above.

"Annoyance" has been the term used to describe the community's collective feelings about noise ever since the early noise surveys in the 1950s and 1960s, although some have suggested that this term tends to minimize the impact. While "aversion" or "distress" might be more appropriate descriptors, their use would make comparisons to previous research difficult. It should be clear, however, that annoyance can connote more than a slight irritation; it can mean a significant degradation in the quality of life. This represents a degradation of health in accordance with the WHO's definition of health, meaning total physical and mental well-being, as well as the absence of disease.

1. Predicting annoyance for public policy purposes

To facilitate the development of criteria and public policy, Schultz (1978) summarized and analyzed a large number of studies of community annoyance from aircraft, road traffic, and railroad

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 28

noise. As part of this effort, Schultz made several simplifying assumptions, among them that the percentage of the population determined to be "highly annoyed" would be the only parameter plotted as a function of day-night average sound level. The resulting curve portrays annoyance as independent of noise source, and it has been dubbed the Schultz curve.

Recently, Fidell et al. (1991) reanalyzed the original data used by Schultz, adding new data from its community noise surveys. The resulting function shows slightly greater annoyance in the range between DNLS of 51 dB and 72 dB, and slightly less annoyance above about a DNL of 76 dB than the original curve. In general, the two curves are fairly close, indicating that the new studies have not drastically altered the prediction of community annoyance, at least when reactions to various noise sources are plotted together. When annoyance from various noise sources is analyzed separately, however, the new data are quite revealing, as will be discussed below.

Although it has been used internationally in the formation of noise policy, the Schultz curve has been the subject of much debate (Kryter, 1982a, 1982b; Griffiths, 1983). For example, Griffiths (1983) criticizes Schultz for treating attitudinal data categorically (highly annoyed or otherwise) rather than scaling it, for failing to analyze the

distribution of annoyance, for assuming a fixed threshold for noise-related annoyance, and for choosing such an extreme criterion as highly annoyed. Perhaps because of these reasons, as well as a number of others, researchers and policymakers are beginning to examine alternatives to the Schultz curve for predicting community annoyance from noise.

2. Metrics

The metrics most commonly used to describe the relationship between noise and community annoyance are the equivalent continuous sound level, and the day-night average sound level (DNL), composite ratings based on the A-weighted sound level. The DNL is used almost exclusively for airport planning in the U.S., but this practice has recently been called into question. For example, the importance of communication and relaxation in the evening hours has been recognized (in California and occasionally in Europe) by the use of the community noise equivalent level (CNEL), a metric that includes a 5-dB penalty for noises occurring between 7:00 and 10:00 pm as well as the 10-dB nighttime penalty (California Code of Regulations, 1990). In a study of the communities surrounding two French airports, residents expressed the greatest annoyance during the hours between 7:00 and 11:00 pm (Francois, 1977).

Some authorities are considering the use of the sound exposure level (SEL) for evaluating the effects of single events, such as aircraft flyovers (EPA/FAA, 1990). The importance of other parameters are also being considered, such as rise time (or onset time) as an indicator of the annoyance from low-flying military aircraft (Harris, 1989). Officials from the U.S. Forest Service report that their agency has begun to use an aircraft detectability criterion to site recreational facilities (Harrison et al., 1990).

3. Criteria

Community annoyance resulting from noise-induced activity interference was one of the most important considerations in EPA's identification of an outdoor DNL of 55 dB as the "safe" level of environmental noise (EPA, 1974a). Some years later, a Federal Inter-Agency Committee on Urban Noise (FICUN) developed guidelines for considering noise in land-use planning and control (DOT, 1980). (19)

In its noise zone classification table, "minimal" exposures to noise there defined as DNLS below 55 dB, and between DNLS of 55 and 65 dB, the exposures there labeled "moderate." However, all

(19) FICUN was an ad-hoc interagency panel composed of representatives from EPA, FAA, HUD, the Department of Defense, and the Veterans Administration. In 1990 another such group, the Federal Interagency Committee on Noise (FICON) has been activated (focussing mainly on aircraft noise), but a report has not been published to date.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 29

of these exposures there considered "acceptable" according to land-use planning standards specified by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). No research was cited to support these conclusions. In a footnote, FICUN stated the following:

HUD, DOT and EPA recognize Ldn = 55 dB as a goal for outdoors in residential areas in protecting the public health and welfare with an adequate margin of safety (Reference: EPA "Levels" Document.) However, it is not a regulatory goal. It is a level defined by a negotiated scientific consensus without concern for economic and technological feasibility or the needs and desires of any particular community.

The Department of Transportation's Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has adopted a DNL of 65 as the point above which residential land-use becomes "normally unacceptable." Below this level, the FAA does not require airport authorities to draw noise contours or discuss the impact of airport noise on the surrounding communities for purposes of compatibility planning or to receive grants under the Part 150 program. (20) Thus, public policy decisions, at least on the federal level, have not considered the annoyance of individuals living in the DNL 55-65 dB range.

Recent research confirms the findings of earlier investigations relied upon by the EPA, that annoyance is often generated at day-night average sound levels well below 65 dB (Fidell et al., 1985; Fidell et al., 1991; Hall et al., 1981). Figures 4 and 5 from Fidell et al. (1991) portray the responses from surveys of two mid-sized airports in California: Burbank Airport and the Orange County Airport. The percentage of respondents highly annoyed is depicted as a function of DNL, and compared to the Schultz curve. Both studies show significantly greater numbers of people highly annoyed than would have been predicted by the Schultz curve. For example, at 60 dB, as many as 70 percent of the Burbank population described themselves as highly annoyed and some 40 percent near the Orange County Airport.

Presumably because of this kind of evidence, another interagency task force has convened to discuss the extent to which day-night average sound levels below 65 dB should be taken into account in assessing the impact of aircraft/airport noise, and to examine the possible need for a single-event metric to supplement the DNL (EPA/FAA, 1990). (21)

4. Sources

The sources of noise producing community annoyance are primarily aircraft, road traffic, and railroad noise, although noise from industry, construction, and within buildings can also be problematical. The leading offenders are usually aircraft and road traffic noise, although the hierarchy depends upon many factors, such as urbanization, numbers of noise events, and proximity to the sources. Recent research indicates that, despite equivalent noise levels, some sources of community noise are more annoying than others, providing further indication that the Schultz curve cannot be valid for all circumstances.

Treating annoyance from all sources with one predictive curve provokes the hoards of oversimplification. De Jong (1990a) reports that an analysis of Dutch studies carried out over the previous 15 years showed that aircraft and highway noise produced considerably more annoyance than equivalent levels of train, tramway, and urban road noise (Miedema, 1988). The divergence was particularly pronounced at high noise levels. The fact that aircraft generate more annoyance than surface transportation is portrayed dramatically in the analysis described above by Fidell et al. (1991), where annoyance related to mid-sized airports appears substantially greater than that

(20) Part 150 studies are conducted at airports where the noise generated by airport construction or expansion is potentially incompatible with the surrounding community. These studies must follow the procedure set out by Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 150.

(21) The U.S. EPA and FAA put together an intragency agreement to examine the extent to which single event analyses and information beyond the Ldn = 65 contour provide useful additions to current methods of evaluating potential airport noise impacts. Under this agreement, a contractor would identify eight existing airports and perform a quantitative analysis using existing data. No new annoyance data would be developed.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

[Link to Figure 4:](#)

Relationship of data from Burbank Airport Study to the 1978 synthesis (Schultz) curve, showing percentage of respondents highly annoyed as a function of day-night average sound level.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 31

[Link to Figure 5:](#)

Relationship of data from Orange County Airport Study to the 1978 synthesis (Schultz) curve, showing percentage of respondents highly annoyed as a function of day-night average sound level.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 32

predicted by the Schultz curve, while annoyance from urban sources, such as trains, trams, and street traffic, is considerably less than that predicted by the Schultz curve.(22) Figures 6 and 7, also from Fidell et al. (1991), depict data from British and Swedish railroad studies, showing somewhat less annoyance from these sources in relation to the Schultz curve.

The explanation for these source-related differences is not necessarily that aircraft noise is inherently more annoying than surface transportation noise. It may be related to differences in people's criteria for responding to various noise sources (de Jong, 1990b; Green and Fidell, 1991). Or it may be caused by differences in sensitivity which are actually biologically based.» Green and Fidell (1991) point out that this evidence does not discredit the predictive validity of the DNL, but suggest that communities adopt a more sensitive criterion when evaluating the impact of aircraft noise. (24)

Impulse noise also appears to be more annoying than continuous noise of equivalent energy, and various penalties have been proposed ranging from 0 dB at relatively high ambient noise levels of about 67 dB, to 10 dB at ambient levels as low as 35 dB (Rice, 1983). Vos and Smoorenburg (1983) have recommended a formula for computing the impulse noise penalty, taking into account the type of noise source, the signal level, and the ambient noise level.

As de Jong points out (1990b), most people are exposed to some combination of noise sources, posing a very complex predictive problem. Several models for predicting noise annoyance from complex sources have been proposed, but most fail to solve the difficult theoretical problems involved (de Jong cites Berglund et al., 1981, and Miedema, 1985). Among the groups working on these models are the Institute for Sound and Vibration Research in England, and the Netherlands' Organization for Applied Scientific Research, TNO.

5. Nonacoustics variables

Although it is dear that community annoyance is positively correlated with noise exposure level, other variables also appear to be important, such as ambient noise level, time of day and year, location, and socioeconomic status. None of these other variables, however, is as powerful as the attitude of the residents surveyed. This is a good example of the fact that the human being is not a black box, where the effect is a simple consequence of the input. In a recent analysis of 280 social surveys, Fields (1990) examined 17 hypotheses as they relate to community

annoyance from noise. Besides noise exposure level, the only variables Fields identified as strongly correlated with noise annoyance there the attitudinal hypotheses: (1) fear that the noise source might be a danger to the neighborhood, (2) belief that the noise is preventable, (3) awareness that non-noise problems are associated with the noise source, (4) stated sensitivity to noise, and (5) belief that the economic activity represented by the source is not important for the community.

6. Habituation

The evidence is fairly dear that so long as the stimulus remains the same, noise annoyance does not subside over time (e.g., Fields, 1990). Griffiths (1983) cites studies showing no habituation for highway noise 4 months to 2 years after the opening of new routes. De long (1990) found that annoyance in a previously surveyed community increased by 10 percent with no change in noise levels. He suggests that this increase could represent a shift of internal criteria due to increased publicity and other factors, or perhaps an increase in physiological sensitization.

(22) See also Fidell et al. (1985), Hall et al. (1981), and de Jong (1990).

(23) De Jong (1990b) cites the work of Di Nisi et al. (1987) and Ising, et al.(1981b) to support this theory.

(24) Green and Fidell found a difference of 5.2 dB between the noise levels at which the same percentage of people are highly annoyed by aircraft noise versus noise from surface transportation.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 33

[Link to Figure 6:](#)

Relationship of data from British Railroad Study to the 1978 synthesis (Schultz) curve, showing percentage of respondents highly annoyed as a function of day-night average sound level.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 34

[Link to Figure 7:](#)

Relationship of data from Swedish Railroad Study to the 1978 synthesis (Schultz) curve, showing percentage of respondents highly annoyed as a function of day-night average sound level.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 35

7. Annoyance and health

There has been very little study of the effects of noise-related annoyance on general health, although this would appear to be a fertile field. The study mentioned in section E.4, above by Rehm (1983) suggests a relationship between annoyance and cardiovascular disorders. Likewise, another study indicates a connection between noise and subjective health complaints (Pulles, et al., 1990). De Jong (1990a) refers to the recent use in Germany of the concept of "substantial annoyance" as a predictor of possible health damage.(25) He recommends the development of an integrated theory of noise effects "to uncover the relationships among medical, physiological, behavioral, and ecological effects of environmental noise. " (de Jong, 1990a, p.520)

8. Summary: Annoyance

Annoyance can be viewed as the expression of negative feelings resulting from interference with activities, as well as disruption of one's peace of mind and the enjoyment of one's environment. Although this reaction can run the gamut of mild irritation to extreme distress, only responses categorized as "highly annoyed" (and greater) have been used to measure the impact of noise on communities. The most respected and widely used criterion to assess community annoyance in the U.S. has been the Schultz curve, although this criterion has been the subject of heated debate. Several recent studies indicate that the Schultz curve underestimates annoyance due to aircraft noise and overestimates annoyance from the noise of urban traffic and trains, leading to the conclusion that annoyance from these categories should be assessed separately. In addition, there has been growing interest in supplementing the traditional DNL with a descriptor for single events. *SEL, Leq*

add to support noise monitoring
EPA's Levels Document identified the outdoor level to protect against activity interference as a day-night average sound level of 55 dB. This identification was not to be construed as a standard or regulation, (26) but as information to aid states, localities, and the general public. Later, an interagency task force identified average levels between 55 and 65 dB as "acceptable" for purposes of land-use planning. The DNL 65-dB criterion, which has been applied particularly to airport noise assessments, is now being reconsidered by another interagency task force.

There is evidence that impulse noise is more annoying than continuous noise of equivalent energy, and various correction factors have been proposed to account for the difference. In addition, most people are exposed to a combination of noise sources, and models for predicting the resulting annoyance are in the formative stages.

63 : The most important variables other than noise exposure level relate to people's attitudes about the noise, such as fear of possible danger, stated sensitivity, and the belief that the noise is preventable. Finally, it appears that noise-related annoyance does not subside over time.

(25) De Jong cites Jansen (1986).

(26) See Foreword, Levels Document (EPA, 1974a).

Top

Return to NPC Library

Return to NPC Home Page

VI. Conclusions

Noise has a significant impact on the quality of American life. There is no evidence that the impact has diminished in the years since ONAC was abolished. Rather, it appears that the impact is at least as great, and most probably greater, than it was 10 years ago, due to population growth, especially in urban areas, and the proliferation of certain noise sources.

A considerable amount of noise effects research has been conducted over the last decade, much of it taking place in the European nations where governmental concern about noise is greater than it is in the U.S. at this time. These studies have expanded the knowledge base and filled certain gaps. Many of them suggest important interrelationships between the various noise effects that remain largely unexplored. For example, perceived control over noise appears to decrease its adverse effects on the subsequent performance of certain tasks. The concept of control also has a bearing on annoyance from noise, as do several other nonacoustic factors. Annoyance appears to be related to extra-auditory health effects, and chronic sleep interference, which is a component of annoyance, can have adverse effects on health and well-being.

All of these effects are, to a varying degree, stress related. Nowadays there is increasing evidence in the medical literature on the relationship between stress and illness, one which is often exacerbated by lack of control.

Cumulatively, this evidence suggests the potential for a unifying hypothesis that may well explain some of the health effects that have been observed in connection to noise exposure, but have usually been dismissed because of the absence or insufficiency of direct cause and effect relationships. Such a hypothesis, however, can only be validated by a new interdisciplinary approach, one which takes a broader and somewhat different perspective than is currently employed. This approach could very well provide the key to understanding a great deal more about the general impact of noise on society, and the extra-auditory effects in particular.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 37

References

AAR (1991) Carloads of revenue freight traffic for major railroads. Weekly Railroad Traffic Report, Association of American Railroads, Washington, DC.

ABEL, S.M., ALBERTI, P.W. HAYTHORNTHWAITE, C., and RIKO, K. (1982) Speech intelligibility in noise: Effects of fluency and hearing protector type. J. Acoust. Soc. Am., 71, 708-715.

ACT (1969) An act prohibiting the sale, advertisement and importation of hazardous products. In Canada's Gazette II (1980). Queen's Printer for Canada.

AIR TRANSPORT ASSOC. (1991a) Traffic summary: 1970-1990: U.S. scheduled airlines. Air Transp. Assoc., Washington, DC.

AIR TRANSPORT ASSOC. (1991b) U.S. airline fleet inventory (year-end 1989) by year of delivery to original owner. Air Transp. Assoc., Washington, DC.

AIRPORT NOISE AND CAPACITY ACT (1990) Prohibition on operation of certain aircraft not complying with stage 3 noise levels, Section 9308 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, Pub. L. No. 101-508.

ALLEN, C.H. and BERGER, E.H. (1990) Development of a unique passive hearing protector with level-dependent and flat attenuation characteristics. Noise Control Eng. J., 34, 97-105.

AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSOC. (1991) American Trucking Trends. Amer. Truck. Assoc. Information Center, Alexandria, VA.

ANON. (1982) Hearing loss threatens most general aviation pilots. Aviation Safety, 2, no. 11, 1-5.

AXELSSON, A., JERSON, T., and LINDGREN, F. (1981) Noisy leisure time activities in teenage boys. Am. Ind. Hyg. J., 42, 229-233.

AXELSSON, A., ANIANSSON, G. and COSTA, O. (1987) Hearing loss in school children. *Scand. Audiol.* 16, 137-143.

BABISCH, W. and GALLACHER, J.E.J. (1990) Traffic noise, blood pressure and other risk factors - The Caerphilly and Speedwell collaborative heart disease studies. In: Berglund, B. and Lindvall, T., eds. *Noise as a Public Health Problem*, Vol. 4, Swedish Council for Building Research, Stockholm.

BARONE, J.A., PETERS, J.M., GARABRANT, D.H., BERNSTEIN, L. and KREBSBACH, R. (1987) Smoking as a risk factor in noise-induced hearing loss. *J. Occup. Med.*, 29, 741-745.

BAUGHN, W.L. (1973) Relation between daily noise exposure and hearing loss based on the evaluation of 6,835 industrial noise exposure cases, (Joint EPA/USAF study) AMRL-TR-73-53, Aerospace Medical Research Lab, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH.

BBN (1971) Survey of annoyance from motor vehicle noise. Report no. 2112 prepared for the Automobile Manufacturers Assoc., Inc. by Bolt Beranek and Newman, Inc., Cambridge, MA.

BBN (1976) Economic impact analysis of proposed noise control regulation. Report no. 3246, prepared for U.S. Dept. Labor, OSHA. Bolt Beranek and Newman, Inc., Cambridge, MA.

BERANEK, L.L. (1954) *Acoustics*. NY, McGraw-Hill.

BERANEK, L.L. (1989) Balanced noise-criterion (NCB) curves. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 86, 650-664.

BERANEK, L.L., BLAZIER, W.E., and FIGWER, J.J. (1971) Preferred noise criterion (PNC) curves and their application to rooms. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 50, 1223-1228.

BERGER, E.H. (1983) Using the NRR to estimate the real world performance of hearing protectors. *Sound and Vibration*, 17, 12-18.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 38

BERGER, E.H. (1991) Letter to David Pritzker, Admin. Conf. U.S., April 1, 1991.

BERGER, E.H., ROYSTER, L.H., and THOMAS, W.G. (1978) Presumed noise-induced permanent threshold shift resulting from exposure to an A-weighted Leq of 89 dB. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 64, 192-197.

BERGER, E.H., ROYSTER, J.D., CASALI, J.G., MERRY, C.J., MOZO, B.T., and ROYSTER, L.H. (1990) Results of a pilot interlaboratory comparison of REAT measurements of hearing protectors, coordinated by ANSI S12/WG 11. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, Suppl, 1, 88, S11.

BERGLUND, B., BERGLUND, U., GOLDSTEIN, M., & LINDVALL, T. (1981) Loudness (or annoyance) summation of combined community noises. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 70, 1628-1634.

BLS (1991a) *Employment and Earnings*, March 1991. Dept. Labor, Bu. Labor Statistics, Washington, DC.

BLS (1991b) *Industry analytical ratios for manufacturing, employees*. Bu. Labor Statistics, Washington, DC.

BLS (1991c) *Basic industry data for manufacturing, employees*. Bu. Labor Statistics, Washington, DC.

BOETTCHER, F.A., HENDERSON, D., GRATTON, M.A., BYRNE, C., and BANCROFT, B. (1989) Recent advances in the understanding of noise interactions. *Arch. Complex Environ. Studies*, 1, 15-21.

- BOHNE, B.A. and PEARSE, M.W. (1982) Cochlear damage from daily exposure to low-frequency noise. Unpub. manuscript., Washington University Medical School, Dept. Otolaryngol., St. Louis, MO.
- BROADBENT, D.E. (1971) *Decision and Stress*, London and N.Y., Academic Press.
- BROADBENT, D.E. (1979) Human performance and noise. In Harris, C.M., ed., *Handbook of Noise Control*, 2nd ed., NY, McGraw-Hill.
- BROADBENT, D.E. (1983) Recent advances in understanding performance in noise. In: Rossi, G., ed. *Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress on Noise as a Public Health Problem*, Vol. 2, Milan, Centro Ricerche e Studi Amplifon.
- BRONZAFI, A.L. (1981) The effect of a noise abatement program on reading ability. *J. Environ. Psych.*, 1, 215-222.
- BRONZAFI, A.L. and MCCARTHY, D.P. (1975) The effects of elevated train noise on reading ability. *Environ. & Behavior*, 7, 517-527.
- BROSTE, S.K., HANSEN, D.A., STRAND, R.L., and STUELAND, D.G. (1989) Hearing loss among highschool farm students. *Am. J. Pub. Health*, 79, 619-622.
- BRYANT, B.E. (1991) Changing population patterns (p.550). In: *The World Almanac and Book of Facts*, N.Y., Pharos Books.
- BURNS, W. and ROBINSON, D.W. (1970) *Hearing and Noise in Industry*, London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS (1990) Title 21, Chapt. 2.5, Subchapter 6, "Noise Standards".
- CANTONI, C. (1991) Letter to David Pritzker, Admin. Conf. U.S., Mar. 16, 1991.
- CARNEY, P.J. (1991) Letter to David Pritzker, Admin. Conf. U.S., Apr. 4, 1991.
- CHUNG, D.Y., GANNON, R.P., WILSON, G.N., and MASON, K. (1981) Shooting, sensorineural hearing loss, and workers' compensation. *J. Occup. Med.*, 23, 481-484.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 39

- CLARK, W.W. (1991) Noise exposure from leisure activities: A review. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 90, 175-181. .
- CLARK, W.W., and BOHNE, B.A., (1986) Temporary hearing losses following attendance at a rock concert. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 79, S48. "
- COHEN, A. (1977) Extraauditory effects of noise on behavior and health. In Lee, D.K., Folk, H.L., Murphy, S.D., and Geiger, S.R., eds. *Handbook of Physiology: Reactions to environmental agents*, Section 9. Baltimore, Williams and Wilkins. COHEN, P. (1990) Drumming: How risky is it to your hearing? *Modern Drummer*, (Oct.) p.24.
- COHEN, S. and THEINSTEIN, N. (1981) Nonauditory effects of noise on behavior and health. *J. Soc. Issues*, 37, 36-70.
- DANENBERG, M.A., LOOS-COSGROVE, M., and LoVERDE, M. (1987) Temporary hearing loss and rock music. *Lang. Sp. and Hear. Serv. in Schools*, 18, 267-274.

DAVIES, D.R. and JONES, D.M. (1975) The effects of noise and incentives upon retention in short-term memory. *Brit. J. Psychol.*, 66, 61-68.

DAVIS, A.C., FORTNUM, H.M., COLES, R.R.A., HAGGARD, M.P., and LUTMAN, M.E. (1985) Damage to hearing arising from leisure noise: A review of the literature. MRC Institute of Hearing Research, Univ. of Nottingham, Nottingham NG7 2RD, U.K.

DEPT. COMMERCE (1991) Survey of Current Business, U.S. Dept. Commerce, Washington, DC.

van DIJK, F.J.H. (1990) Epidemiological research on non-auditory effects of occupational noise exposure since 1983. In: Berglund, B. and Lindvall, T., eds. *Noise as a Public Health Problem*, Vol. 4, Sthedish Council for Building Research, Stockholm.

van DIJK, F.J.H., SOUMAN, A. and de VRIES, F. (1983) Industrial noise, annoyance and blood pressure. In: Rossi, G., ed. *Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress on Noise as a Public Health Problem*, Vol. I, Milan, Centro Ricerche e Studi Amplifon.

DI NISI, J., MUZET, A., and THEBER, L.D. (1987) Cardiovascular responses to noise: Effects of self-estimated sensitivity to noise, sex, and time of the day. *J. Sound Vib.*, 114, 271-279.

DOT (1980) Guidelines for Considering Noise in Land Use Planning and Control. Federal Interagency Committee on Urban Noise. U.S. Dept Transportation, Wash., DC.

EARSHEN, J.J. (1986) Sound measurement: Instrumentation and noise descriptors. In: Berger, E.H., Ward, W.D., Morrill, J.C. and Royster, L.H. *Noise and Hearing Conservation Manual*, Akron, OH, American Industrial Hygiene Assoc.

EBERHARDT, J.L. (1987) The influence on sleep of noise and vibrations caused by road traffic. (Thesis) Lund, Stheden.

EBERHARDT, J.L. (1990) The disturbance by road traffic noise of the sleep of prepubertal children as studies in the home. In: Berglund, B. and Lindvall, T., eds. *Noise as a Public Health Problem*, Vol. 5, Sthedish Council for Building Research, Stockholm.

EBERHARDT, J.L., STRALE, L.O. and BERLIN, M.H. (1987) The influence of continuous and intermittent traffic noise on sleep. *J. Sound Vib.*, 116, 445-464.

ELDRED, K.M. (1990) Noise at the year 2000. In: Berglund, B. and Lindvall, T., eds. *Noise as a Public Health Problem*, Vol. 5, Sthedish Council for Building Research, Stockholm.

EPA (1973a) Public Health and Thelfare Criteria for Noise. EPA 550/9/73/002, U.S. EPA, Washington, DC.

EPA (1973b) Proceedings of the International Congress on Noise as a Public Health Problem. EPA 550/9/73-008, U.S. EPA, Washington, DC.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 40

EPA (1974a) Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Thelfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety. EPA 550/9-74-004, U.S. EPA, Washington, DC.

EPA (1974b) Population Distribution of the United States as a Function of Outdoor Noise Level. EPA 550/9-74-009, U.S. EPA, Washington, DC.

EPA (1974c) Railroad noise: Proposed emission standards. 39 Fed. Reg., 24580.

EPA (1978) Protective Noise Levels: Condensed Version of EPA Levels Document. EPA 550/9-79-100.

EPA (1979) Noise labeling requirements for hearing protectors. 44 Fed. Reg., 56130-56147.

EPA (1981) Noise in America: The Extent of the Noise Problem. EPA/9-81-101. U.S. EPA, Washington, DC.

EPA/FAA (1990) A quantitative comparison of calculated single event noise levels and day night average sound levels in the vicinity of airports. Interagency agreement no. DW69934410-0 between the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration.

FAY, T.H. (1991) Personal communication.

FECHTER, L.D. (1989) A mechanistic basis for interactions between noise and chemical exposure. Arch. Complex Environ. Studies, 1, 23-28.

FIDELL, S. (1990) An historical perspective on predicting the annoyance of noise exposure. In: Busch-Vishniac, I., ed, 1990 National Conference on Noise Control Engineering: Reducing the Annoyance of Noise, Univ. Texas, Austin, TX.

FIDELL, S., BARBER, D.S., and SCHULTZ, T.J. (1991) Updating a dosage-effect relationship for the prevalence of annoyance due to general transportation noise. J. Acoust. Soc. Am., 89, 221-233.

FIDELL, S., HORONJEFF, R., MILLS, J., BALDWIN, E., TEFFETELLER, S. and PEARSONS, K. (1985) Aircraft noise annoyance at three joint air carrier and general aviation airports. J. Acoust. Soc. Am., 77, 1054-1068.

FIELDS, J.M. (1990) A quantitative summary of non-acoustical variables' effects on reactions to environmental noise. In: Busch-Vishniac, I., ed, 1990 National Conference on Noise Control Engineering: Reducing the Annoyance of Noise, Univ. Texas, Austin, TX.

FIELDS, J.M. and POWELL, C.A. (1987) Community reactions to helicopter noise: Results from an experimental study. J. Acoust. Soc. Am., 82, 479-492.

FIELDS, J.M. and WALKER, J.G. (1982) The response to railway noise in residential areas in Great Britain. J. Sound Vib., 85, 177.

FINKLEMAN, J.M, and GLASS, D.C. (1970) Reappraisal of the relationship between noise and human performance by means of a subsidiary task measure. J. Appl. Psychol, 54, 211 -213.

FLORENTINE, M. (1985) Speech perception in noise by fluent, non- native listeners. J. Acoust. Soc. Am., Suppl, 1, S106.

FRANCOIS, J. (1977) La Prise en Compte de la Gene Nocturne dans le Calcul de l'Indice Psophique. [Taking into account nighttime annoyance in the calculation of the Psophic Index.] Institute Francaise d'Opinion Publique (IFOP) Paris and STNA/2n, Paris. NASA Technical Memorandum 76580, May 1981.

FRENCH, N.R, and STEINBERG, J.C. (1947) Factors governing the intelligibility of speech sounds. J. Acoust. Soc. Am., 19, 90-119.

von GIERKE, H.E., ROBINSON, D., and KARMY, S.J. (1981) Results of the workshop on impulse noise and auditory hazard. Institute of Sound and Vibration Research, Southampton, England.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 41

- GJAEVENES, K. (1966) Measurements on the impulse noise from cracker and toy firearms. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 39, 403-404.
- GJAEVENES, K. (1967) Damage-risk criterion for the impulsive noise of "toys". *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 42, 268.
- GLASS, D.C. and SINGER, J.E. (1972) *Urban Stress: Experiments on Noise and Social Stressors*. NY, Academic Press.
- GREEN, D.M. and FIDELL, S. (1991) Variability in the criterion for reporting annoyance in community noise surveys. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 89, 234-243.
- GRIEFAHN, B. (1990) Research on noise and sleep: Present state. In: Berglund, B. and Lindvall, T., eds. *Noise as a Public Health Problem*, Vol. 5, Sthedish Council for Building Research, Stockholm.
- GRIEFAHN, B. and GROS, E. (1983) Disturbances of sleep: Interaction between noise, personal, and psychological variables. In: Rossi, G., ed. *Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress on Noise as a Public Health Problem*, Vol. 2, Milan, Centro Ricerche e Studi Amplifon.
- GRIFFITHS, I.D. (1983) Community response to noise. In: Rossi, G., ed. *Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress on Noise as a Public Health Problem*, Vol. 2, Milan, Centro Ricerche e Studi Amplifon.
- GUIGNARD, J.C. (1973) A basis for limiting noise exposure for hearing conservation. Joint EPA/AF study) EPA-550/9-73-001-A, AMRL-TR-73-90.
- HALL, F., BIRNIE, S., TAYLOR, S.M., and PALMER, J. (1981) Direct comparison of community response to road traffic noise and to aircraft noise. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 70, 1690-1698.
- HARRIS, C.S. (1968) The effects of high intensity noise on human performance. U.S. Air Force rept. AMRL-TR-67-119, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH.
- HARRIS, C.S. (1989) Effects of military training route noise on human annoyance. U.S. Air Force rept. AAMRL-TR-89-041, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH.
- HARRISON, R.T., HARTMANN, L.A., and MAKEL, W.J. (1990) Annoyance from aircraft overflights in wilderness. In: Busch-Vishniac, I., ed. *1990 National Conference on Noise Control Engineering: Reducing the Annoyance of Noise*, Univ. Texas, Austin, TX.
- HARTLEY, L.R., DUNNE, M., SCHWARTZ, S. and BROWN, J. (1986) Effect of noise on cognitive strategies in a sentence verification task. *Ergonomics*, 29, 607-617.
- HATTIS, D. and RICHARDSON, B. (1980) Noise, general stress responses, and cardiovascular disease processes: Review and reassessment of hypothesized relationships. EPA 550/9-80-101, U.S. EPA, Washington, DC.
- HENDERSON, D. and HAMERNIK, R.P. (1986) Impulse noise: Critical review. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 80, 569-584.
- HOCKEY, G.R.J. and HAMILTON, P. (1970) Arousal and information selection in short-term memory. *Nature*, 226, 866-867.
- HODGE and McCOMMONS (1966) Acoustical hazards of children's toys. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 40, 911- .
- HOERMANN, H., LAZARUS-MAINKA, G. SCHUBEIUS, M., and LAZARUS, H. (1984) The effect of noise and the thearing of ear protectors on verbal communication. *Noise Control Eng. J.*, 23, 69-77.
- HOUTGAST, T. (1980) Indoor speech intelligibility and indoor noise level criteria. In: Tobias, J.V., Jansen, G., and Ward, W.D. eds., *Proceedings of the Third International Congress on Noise as a*

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 42

Public Health Problem, ASHA Reports 10, American Speech-Language- Hearing Assoc., . Rockville, MD.

HOUTGAST, T. and STEENEKEN, H.J.M. (1983) Experimental verification of the STI: A valid basis for setting indoor noise level criteria. In: Rossi, G., ed. Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress on Noise as a Public Health Problem, Vol. I, Milan, Centro Ricerche e Studi Amplifon.

HOWELL, K. and MARTIN, A.M. (1975) An investigation of the effects of hearing protectors on vocal communication in noise. J. Sound Vib., 41, 181-196.

HUMES, L.E. (1984) Noise-induced hearing loss as influenced by other agents and by some physical characteristics of the individual. J. Acoust. Soc. Am., 76, 1318-1329.

HUMES, L.E., DIRKS, D.D., BELL, T.S., AHLSTROM, C. and KINCAID, G.E. (1986) Application of the Articulation Index and the Speech Transmission Index to the recognition of speech by normal-hearing and hearing-impaired listeners. J. Sp. Hear. Res., 29, 447-462.

HUMES, L.E., DIRKS, D.D., BELL, T.S., and KINCAID, G.E. (1987) J. Acoust. Soc. Am., 81, 765-773.

IEC (1987) International Electrotechnical Commission. Sound system equipment part 16: Report on the RASTI method for the objective rating of speech intelligibility in auditoria, Pub. 268.

ISING, H. and GUNTHER, T. (1981a) Blutdrucksteigerung durch Lärm am Arbeitsplatz. In: Schriftenreihe Arbeitsschutz, Nr. 31, Stress am Arbeitsplatz. Bundesanstalt für Arbeitsschutz und Unfallforschung, Dortmund, FRG.

ISING, H., GUNTHER, T., HANDROCK, M., MICHALAK, R., SCHWARZE, J., VORMANN, J. and WUSTER, G.B. (1981b) Lärmwirkungen und Mineralstoffwechsel. Z Lärmbekämpfung, 28, 176-185.

ISING, H., GUNTHER, T., HAVESTEDT, C., KRAUSE, C.H., MARKERT, B., MELCHERT, H.U., SCHOKNECHT, G., THEFELD, W., and TIETZE, K.W., (1981c) Blutdrucksteigerung during Lärm am Arbeitsplatz. (Hrsg.) BAU (Dortmund), Forschungsbericht, Nr. 225, Wirtschaftsverlag NW.

ISO (1990) International Organization for Standardization. ISO 1999.2 Acoustics: Determination of occupational noise exposure and estimate of noise-induced hearing impairment, Geneva, Switzerland.

JANSEN, G. (1986) Zur "erheblichen Blastigung" und "Gefährdung" durch Lärm. Z. Lärmbekämpfung, 33, 2-7.

JOHNSON, D.L. (1973) Prediction of NIPTS due to continuous noise exposure. (Joint EPA/AF study) EPA-550/9-73-001-B, AMRL-TR-73-91.

JOHNSON, D.L. and RIFFLE, C. (1982) Effects of gunfire on hearing level for selected individuals of the inter-industry noise study. J. Acoust. Soc. Am., 72, 1311-1314.

JONES, D.M. (1983) Loud noise and levels of control : A study of Serial Reaction. In: Rossi, G., ed. Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress on Noise as a Public Health Problem, Vol. 2, Milan, Centro Ricerche e Studi Amplifon.

JONES, D. (1990) Progress and prospects in the study of performance in noise. In: Berglund, B. and Lindvall, T., eds. Noise as a Public Health Problem, Vol. 4, Sthedish Council for Building Research, Stockholm.

de JONG, R.G. (1990a) Community response to noise: a Review of recent developments. *Environment International*, 16, 515-522.

de JONG, R.G. (1990b) Review of research developments on community response to noise. In: Berglund, B. and Lindvall, T., eds. *Noise as a Public Health Problem*, Vol. 5, Swedish Council for Building Research, Stockholm.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 43

JURRIENS, A.A., GRIEFAHN, B., KUMAR, A. VALLET, M., and WILKINSON, R.T. (1983) An essay in European research collaboration: Common results from the project on traffic noise and sleep in the home. In: Rossi, G., ed. *Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress on Noise as a Health Problem*, Vol. 2, Milan, Centro Ricerche e Studi Amplifon.

KILLION, M., de VILLBISS, E., and STEWART, J. (1988) An earplug with uniform 15-dB attenuation. *Hearing Journal*, 41, 14-17.

KNIPSCHILD, P. and OUDSHOORN, N. (1977) Medical effects of aircraft noise: Drug survey. *Int. Arch. Occup. Envir. Health*, 40, 197-200.

KNIPSCHILD, P. MEIJER, H., and SALLE, H. (1981) Aircraft noise and birth weight. *Int. Arch. Occup. Envir. Health*, 48, 131-136.

KRAMER, M.B. and WOOD, D. (1982) Noise-induced hearing loss in rural schoolchildren. *Scand. Audiol.*, 11, 279-280.

KRYTER, K.D. (1982a) Community annoyance from aircraft and ground vehicle noise. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 72, 1222-1242.

KRYTER, K.D. (1982b) Rebuttal by Karl D. Kryter to "Comments by T.J. Schultz". *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 72, 1253-1257.

LAHTELA, K., NIEMI, P., KURSELA, V., and HYPER, K. (1986) Noise and visual choice -reaction time: A large-scale population survey. *Scan. J. Psych.*, 76, 89-95.

LANGER, E., and RODIN, J. (1976) The effects of choice and enhanced personal responsibility for the aged: A field experiment in an institutional setting. *J. Pers. Soc. Psych.*, 34, 191-198.

LAZARUS, H. (1986a) A model of speech communication and its evaluation under disturbing conditions. In: Schick, A., Hoge, H., and LaZarus-Mainka, G., eds., *Contributions to Psychological Acoustics: Results of the Fourth Oldenburg Symposium on Psychological Acoustics*.

LAZARUS, H. (1986b) Prediction of verbal communication in noise - a review: Part I. *Applied Acoustics*, 19, 439-464.

LAZARUS, H. (1987) Prediction of verbal communication in noise - a development of generalized SIL curves and the quality of communication: Part 2. *Applied Acoustics*, 20, 245-261.

LAZARUS H. (1990) New techniques for describing and assessing speech communication under conditions of interference. In: Berglund, B. and Lindvall, T., eds. *Noise as a Public Health Problem*, Vol. 4, Swedish Council for Building Research, Stockholm.

- LAZARUS, H., and HOGE, H. (1986) Industrial safety: Acoustic signals for danger situations in factories. *Applied Ergonomics*, 41-46.
- LEROUX T. and LAROCHE, C. (1991) proposed regulations on noisy toys. Report presented to The Association des Consommateurs du Quebec. Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
- LIBERMAN M.C. (1990) Structural basis of noise-induced threshold shift. In: Berglund, B. and Lindvall, T. eds. *Noise as a Public Health Problem*, Vol. 4, Swedish Council for Building Research, Stockholm.
- LINDEMAN, H.E. (1976) Speech intelligibility and the use of hearing protectors. *Audiology*, 15 348-356.
- LNE (1973) Laboratoire National d'Essais (France). *Essais acoustiques sur des jouets*.
- LUNDEEN, C. (1991) Prevalence of hearing impairment among school children. *Lang. Sp. and Hear. Serv. In Schools*, 22, 269-271.
- MARSHALL and BRANDT (1973) Temporary threshold shift from a toy cap gun. *J. Sp. Hear. Dis.*, 34, 163-168.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 44

- MATTHEWS, K.E, and CANNON, L.K. (1975) Environmental noise level as a determinant of helping behavior. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol*, 32, 571-577. MAY, D.N., and RICE, C.G. (1971) Effects of startle due to pistol shots on control precision performance. *J. Sound Vib.*, 15, 197-202.
- MCDONALD, A.D., MCDONALD, J.C., ARMSTRONG, B., CHERRY, N.M., NOLIN, A.D., and ROBERT, D. (1988) Prematurity and work in pregnancy. *Brit. J. Indust. Med.*, 45, 56d2.
- MCFADDEN, D. and PLATTSMIER, H.S. (1983) Aspirin can potentiate the temporary hearing loss induced by intense sounds. *Hear. Res.*, 9, 295.316.
- MICHALAK, R., ISING, H., and REBENTISCH, E. (1990) Acute circulatory effects of military low-altitude flight noise. *Int. Arch. Occup. Envir. Health*, 62, 365.372.
- MIEDEMA, H.M.E. (1985) Annoyance caused by two noise sources. *J. Sound Vib.*, 98, 592.595.
- MIEDEMA, H.M.E. (1988) LAeq-hinder relaties voor omgevingsgeluidbronnen. NIPG.TNO, nr. 88035. Leiden, Netherlands.
- MOE, R. (1966) Norsk Otolaryngol. Foren. Rept. No. 97, 9.
- MURPHY, E. (1989) Townshend. Tinnitus and rock & roll. *Rolling Stone*, July 13-27, 101.
- MOUAT, L. (1990) Airport jams delay New York area. *Christian Science Monitor*, June 1, p.6.
- MUZET, A. (1983) Research on noise-disturbed sleep since 1978. In: Rossi, G., ed. *Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress on Noise as a Public Health Problem*, Vol. 2, Milan, Centro Ricerche e Studi Amplifon.
- NABELEK, A.K. (1983) Acoustics of enclosed spaces for linguistically impaired listeners. In: Rossi, G., ed. *Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress on Noise as a Public Health Problem*, Vol. 2, Milan, Centro Ricerche e Studi Amplifon.
- NIOSH (1973) Occupational noise and hearing:1968.1972. Pub. no. 74-116, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, Cincinnati, OH.

NOBLE, W.G. (1981) Earmuffs, exploratory head movement, and horizontal and vertical sound localization. *J. Aud. Res.*, 21, 1-12.

ODESS, J.S. (1972) Acoustic trauma of sportsman hunter due to gun firing. *Laryngoscope*, 82, 1971-1989.

OHRSTROM, E. (1983) Sleep disturbances - after effects of different traffic noises. In: Rossi, G., ed. *Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress on Noise as a Public Health Problem*, Vol. 2, Milan, Centro Ricerche e Studi Amplifon.

ORCHIK, D.J., SCHUMAIER, D.R., SHEA, J.J. Jr., EMMETT, J.R., MORETZ, W.H. and SHEA, J.J. III (1987) Sensorineural hearing loss in cordless telephone injury. *Otolaryngol. -Head and Neck Surg.*, 96, 30-33.

ORCHIK, D.J., SCHUMAIER, D.R., SHEA, J.J., MORETZ, W.H. (1985) Intensity and frequency of sound levels from cordless telephones. *Clinical Pediatrics*, 24, 699-690.

OSHA (1981) Occupational Safety and Health Admin., Occupational noise exposure: Hearing conservation amendment. 46 Fed. Reg. 4078-4179.

OSHA (1983) Occupational Safety and Health Admin., Occupational noise exposure: Hearing conservation amendment; final rule. 48 Fed. Reg. 9738-9784.

OSHA (1986) Instruction CPL 2-2.35: Guidelines for Noise Enforcement. U.S. Dept. Labor, OSHA, Washington, DC.

PARKER, D.E., RITZ, L.A., TUBBS, R.L., and WOOD, D.L. (1976) Effects of sound on the vestibular system. U.S. Air Force rept. AMRL-TR-75-89. Wright-Patterson AFB, OH.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 45

PARKER, D.E., TUBBS, R.L., and LITTLEFIELD, V.M. (1978) Visual- field displacements in human beings evoked by acoustical transients. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 63, 1912-1918.

PASSCHIER-VERMEER, W. (1968) Hearing loss due to steady-state broadband noise. Report 35, Sound and Light Division, Research Institute for Public Health Engineering Delft, Netherlands.

PATTERSON, R.D. (1982) Guidelines for auditory warning systems on civil aircraft. CAA Paper 82017, Civil Aviation Authority, London.

PATTERSON, R.D. (1985) Auditory warning systems for high-workload environments. Paper presented at the 9th Congress of the International Ergonomics Assoc., Bournemouth, England.

PEARSONS, K.S., BARBER, D.S., and TABACHNICK, B.G. (1989) Analyses of the predictability of noise-induced sleep disturbance. U.S. Air Force rept. HSD-TR-89-029. Air Force Systems Command, Brooks AFB, TX.

PEARSONS, K.S., BENNETT, R.L. and FIDELL, S. (1977) Speech levels in various noise environments. EPA-600/1-77-025, U.S. EPA, Washington, DC.

PERCIVAL, L. and LOEB, M. (1980) Influence of noise characteristics on behavioral aftereffects. *Human Factors*, 22, 341-352. PETERSON, E.A., AUGENSTEIN, J.S., and TANIS, D.C. (1978) Continuing studies of noise and cardiovascular function. *J. Sound Vib.*, 59, 123.

PETERSON, E.A., AUGENSTEIN, J.S., TANIS, D., and AUGENSTEIN, D.G., (1981) Noise raises blood pressure without impairing auditory sensitivity. *Science*, 211, 1450-1452.

PETERSON, E.A., AUGENSTEIN, J.S., TANIS, D.C., WARNER, R., and HEAL, A. (1983) In: Rossi, G., ed. Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress on Noise as a Public Health Problem, Vol. 2, Milan, Centro Ricerche e Studi Amplifon.

PHS (1991) Healthy people 2000: National health promotion and disease prevention objectives. U.S. Dept. Health and Human Services, Public Health Service. (PHS) 91-50212. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

PRICE, G.R. (1981) Implications of a critical level in the ear for assessment of noise hazard at high intensities. J. Acoust. Soc. Am., 69, 171-177.

PRICE, G.R. (1983) Relative hazard of weapons impulses. J. Acoust. Soc. Am., 73, 556-566.

PRICE, G.R. (1989) Hazard from an intense midrange impulse. J. Acoust. Soc. Am., 86, 2185-2191.

PROSSER, S., TARTARI, M.C., and ARSLAN, E. (1988) Hearing loss in sports hunters exposed to occupational noise. Brit. J. Audiol., 22, 85-91.

PULLES, T., BIESIOT, W., and STEWART, R. (1990) Adverse effects of environmental noise on health: An interdisciplinary approach. In: Berglund, B. and Lindvall, T., eds. Noise as a Public Health Problem, Vol. 4, Swedish Council for Building Research, Stockholm.

REHM, S. (1983) Research on extraaural effects of noise since 1978. In: Rossi, G., ed. Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress on Noise as a Public Health Problem, Vol. 1, Milan, Centro Ricerche e Studi Amplifon.

REHM, S. and JANSEN, G. (1978) Aircraft noise and premature birth. J. Sound Vib., 59, 133-135.

REINHART, T.E. (1991) Letter to David Pritzker, Admin. Conf. U.S., May 13, 1991.

RICE, C.G. (1983) Joint research on annoyance due to impulse noise: Laboratory studies. In: Rossi, G., ed. Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress on Noise as a Public Health Problem, Vol. 2, Milan, Centro Ricerche e Studi Amplifon.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 46

ROCHE, A.F., SIERVOGEL, R.M., HIMES, J.H., and JOHNSON, D.L. (1978) Longitudinal study of hearing in children: Baseline data concerning auditory thresholds, noise exposure, and biological factors. J. Acoust. Soc. Am., 64, 1593-1601.

ROOD, G.M., CHILLARY, J.A., and COLLISTER, J.B. (1985) Requirements and application of auditory warnings to military helicopters. Paper presented at the 9th Congress of the International Ergonomics Assoc., Bournemouth, England.

ROSEN, S. (1962) Presbycusis study of a relatively noise-free population in the Sudan, Ann. Otol. (St. Louis), 71, 727.

ROVEKAMP, A.J.M. (1983) Physiological effects of environmental noise on normal and more sound-sensitive human beings. In: Rossi, G., ed. Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress on Noise as a Public Health Problem, Vol. 1, Milan, Centro Ricerche e Studi Amplifon.

ROYSTER, L.H., LILLEY, D.T., and THOMAS, W.G. (1980) Recommended criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of hearing conservation programs. Am. Ind. Hyg. Assoc. J., 41, 40-48.

SALAME, P, and BADDELEY, A.D. (1982) Disruption of short-term memory by unattended speech: Implications for the structure of working memory. *J. Verb. Learn, Verb. Behav.*, 21, 150-164.

SALAME, P, and BADDELEY, A. (1983) Differential effects of noise and speech on short-term memory. In: Rossi, G., ed. *Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress on Noise as a Public Health Problem*, Vol. 2, Milan, Centro Ricerche e Studi Amplifon.

SALAME, P, and BADDELEY, A. (1987) Noise, unattended speech and short-term memory. *Ergonomics*, 30, 1185-1194.

SAUSER, W.I. Jr., ARAUZ, C.G., and CHAMBERS, R.M. (1978) Exploring the relationship between level of office noise and salary recommendation: A preliminary research note. *J. Management*, 4, 57-63.

SCHARF, B, and HELLMANN, R. (1979) Comparison of various methods for predicting the loudness and acceptability of noise. Part II: Effects of spectral pattern and tonal components. EPA 550/9-79- 102, U.S. EPA, Washington, DC.

SCHARF, B., HELLMAN, R, and BAUER, J. (1977) Comparison of various methods for predicting the loudness and acceptability of noise. EPA/9-77-101, U.S. EPA, Washington, DC.

SCHORI, T.R, and MCGATHA, E.A. (1978) A real-world assessment of noise exposure. (Joint EPA/AF study) AMRL-TR-77-96, Aerospace Medical Research Lab, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH.

SCHULTZ, T. (1978) Syntheses of social surveys on noise annoyance. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 62, 377-405.

SHERROD, D.R., and DOWNS, R. (1974) Environmental determinants of altruism: The effects of stimulus overload and perceived control on helping. *J. Exptl. Soc. Psychol.*, 10, 468-479.

SINGER, J.E., ACM, J.B., and SCHAEFFER, M.H. (1990) Cognitive changes from noise exposure. In: Berglund, B, and Lindvall, T., eds. *Noise as a Public Health Problem*, Vol. 4, Swedish Council for Building Research, Stockholm.

STARK, J., PYYKKO, I., and PEKKARINEN, J. (1988) Effect of smoking on sensory neural hearing loss. In Claussen, C.-F, Kirtane, M.V., and Schlitter, K, eds, *Vertigo, Nausea, Tinnitus and Hypoacusia in Metabolic Disorders*, Elsevier Science Publishers, B.V.

STEWART, A.P. (1991) Letter to David Pritzker, Admin. Conf. U.S., April 3, 1991.

SUESS, M.J. (1973) The long-term planning of a noise control program. In: Ward, W.D., ed. *Proceedings of the International Congress on Noise as a Public Health Problem*. EPA 550/9/73-008, U.S. EPA, Washington, DC.

[Top](#)

[Return to NPC Library](#)

[Return to NPC Home Page](#)

Page 47

SUTER, A.H. (1978) The ability of mildly hearing-impaired individuals to discriminate speech in noise. (Joint EPA/AF study) EPA 550/9-78-100, AMRL-TR-78-4.

SUTER, A.H. (1983) The relationship of the exchange rate to noise- induced hearing loss. Prepared under contract to JAB Associates and submitted to the Occupational Safety and Health Admin., U.S. Dept Labor, Washington, DC (Docket OSH 011 no. 511).

SUTER, A.H. (1989) The effects of noise on performance. Tech. Mem. 3-89, U.S. Army Human Engineering Lab., Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

THOMPSON, S.J. and FIDELL, S. (1990) Feasibility of studying human health effects of aircraft noise in residential populations. In: Berglund, B. and Lindvall, T., eds. Noise as a Public Health Problem, Vol. 4, Swedish Council for Building Research, Stockholm.

TURKKAN, J.S., HIENZ, R.D. and HARRIS, A.H. (1983) Novel long-term cardiovascular effects of industrial noise. Psychol. and Behav., 33, 21-26.

VALLET, M., BLANCHET, V., and BRUYERE, J.C. (1976) La perturbation du sommeil par le bruit de la circulation routiere: Etude in situ. Recherche Environnement, 3, 183-212.

VALLET, M., LETISSERAND, D., OLIVIER, D., LAURENS, J.F., and CLAIRET, J.M. (1990) Effects of road traffic noise on pulse rate during sleep. In: Berglund, B. and Lindvall, T., eds. Noise as a Public Health Problem, Vol. 5, Swedish Council for Building Research, Stockholm.

VOS, J. and SMOORENBURG, G.F. (1983) Annoyance ratings for impulse and traffic sounds in background noise. In: Rossi, G., ed. Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress on Noise as a Public Health Problem, Vol. 2, Milan, Centro Ricerche e Studi Amplifon.

WARD, W.D. (1983) Noise-induced hearing loss: Research since 1978. In: Rossi, G., ed. Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress on Noise as a Public Health Problem, Vol. 1, Milan, Centro Ricerche e Studi Amplifon.

WARD, W.D. and TURNER, C.W. (1982) The total energy concept as a unifying approach to the prediction of noise trauma and its application to exposure criteria. In Hamernik, R.P., Henderson, D., and Salvi, R., eds. New Perspectives on Noise-Induced Hearing Loss, NY, Raven Press.

WEBSTER, J.C. (1983) Communicating in noise, 1978-1983. In: Rossi, G., ed. Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress on Noise as a Public Health Problem, Vol. 1, Milan, Centro Ricerche e Studi Amplifon.

WESLER, J.E. (1990) Regulating environmental noise. In: Busch-Vishniac, I., ed, 1990 National Conference on Noise Control Engineering: Reducing the Annoyance of Noise, Univ. Texas, Austin, TX.

WEINER, E. (1990) Rising clamor by airport neighbors shows gains in fight against noise. N.Y Times, National, Apr. 17, p. A10.

WETHERELL, E.A. (1987) Control of noise and vibration in dwellings: A practical alternative. Inter-Noise 87, Beijing, China.

WETHERILL, E.A. (1991) Personal communication. Paoletti Associates, San Francisco, CA.

WORLD ALMANAC (1991) The World Almanac and Book of Facts, N.Y., Pharos Books.

<:nav id=mobile-nav class=mobile-nav>

Menu

United States Environmental Protection Agency

Laws & Regulations

Summary of the Noise Control Act

42 U.S.C. §4901 et seq. (1972)

Inadequately controlled noise presents a growing danger to the health and welfare of the Nation's population, particularly in urban areas. The major sources of noise include transportation vehicles and equipment, machinery, appliances, and other products in commerce. The Noise Control Act of 1972 establishes a national policy to promote an environment for all Americans free from noise that jeopardizes their health and welfare. The Act also serves to (1) establish a means for effective coordination of Federal research and activities in noise control; (2) authorize the establishment of Federal noise emission standards for products distributed in commerce; and (3) provide information to the public respecting the noise emission and noise reduction characteristics of such products.

While primary responsibility for control of noise rests with State and local governments, Federal action is essential to deal with major noise sources in commerce, control of which require national uniformity of treatment. EPA is directed by Congress to coordinate the programs of all Federal agencies relating to noise research and noise control.

History of this Act

- [EPA History: Noise Control Act](#)

More Information

- [Air and Radiation: Noise Pollution](#)

Quick Links

- [PDF of the Noise Control Act, from U.S. General Services Administration \(GSA\) \(21 pp, 890K, About PDF\)](#)
- [The official text of the Noise Control Act is available in the United States Code on FDSys, from the U.S. Government Printing Office.](#)

[EPA Home](#)
[Privacy and
Security Notice](#)
[Contact Us](#)

**Last updated on
April 16, 2013**